arXiv:0802.1837v2 [math.NT] 28 Feb 2008

An Inhomogeneous Transference Principle and Diophantine Approximation

Victor Beresnevich* Sanju Velani†
YORK YORK

Dedicated to Vasili Bernik – spasibo Basil!

Abstract

In a landmark paper [29], D.Y. Kleinbock and G.A. Margulis established the fundamental Baker-Sprindzuk conjecture on homogeneous Diophantine approximation on manifolds. Subsequently, there has been dramatic progress in this area of research. However, the techniques developed to date do not seem to be applicable to *inhomogeneous* approximation. Consequently, the theory of inhomogeneous Diophantine approximation on manifolds remains essentially non-existent.

In this paper we develop an approach that enables us to transfer homogeneous statements to inhomogeneous ones. This is rather surprising as the inhomogeneous theory contains the homogeneous theory and so is more general. As a consequence, we establish the inhomogeneous analogue of the Baker-Sprindzuk conjecture. Furthermore, we prove a complete inhomogeneous version of the profound theorem of Kleinbock, Lindenstrauss & Weiss [27] on the extremality of friendly measures. The results obtained in this paper constitute the first step towards developing a coherent inhomogeneous theory for manifolds in line with the homogeneous theory.

---

*EPSRC Advanced Research Fellow, grant EP/C54076X/1
†Research supported by EPSRC grant EP/E061613/1 and INTAS grant 03-51-5070

1 Introduction

The metrical theory of Diophantine approximation on manifolds dates back to the nineteen thirties with a conjecture of K. Mahler [31] in transcendence theory. The conjecture was easily seen to be equivalent to a metrical Diophantine approximation problem restricted to the Veronese curves $\mathcal{V}_n := \{(x, \dots, x^n),\ x \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Mahler's conjecture remained a key open problem in metric number theory for over 30 years and was eventually solved by Sprindzuk [37]. Moreover, its solution led Sprindzuk [39] to make an important general conjecture which we shall shortly describe. The conjecture has been established by Kleinbock & Margulis in their landmark paper [29]. The main result of this paper establishes a complete inhomogeneous version of the theorem of Kleinbock & Margulis and indeed its generalisation to friendly measures [27]. In order to describe these fundamental conjectures and results it is convenient to introduce the notion of Diophantine exponents.

1.1 Exponents of Diophantine approximation

Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ be the set of all $m \times n$ real matrices. Given $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, let $w(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ be the supremum of $w \geqslant 0$ such that for arbitrarily large $Q > 1$ there is a $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \smallsetminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ satisfying

$$\|\boldsymbol{X}\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^m < Q^{-w} \qquad \text{and} \qquad |\mathbf{q}|^n \leqslant Q\,, \tag{1}$$

where $|\mathbf{q}| := \max\{|q_1|, \dots, |q_n|\}$ is the supremum norm and $\|\cdot\|$ is the distance to the nearest integer point. Here and elsewhere $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are treated as columns. It follows that whenever $w(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is finite, the inequality

$$\|\boldsymbol{X}\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^m < |\mathbf{q}|^{-wn}$$

has infinitely many solutions $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ if $w < w(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and has at most finitely many solutions $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ if $w > w(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$. Further, let $w^\times(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ be the supremum of $w \geqslant 0$ such that for arbitrarily large $Q > 1$ there is a $\mathbf{q} = (q_1, \dots, q_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \smallsetminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ satisfying

$$\textstyle\prod\langle \boldsymbol{X}\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{\theta}\rangle < Q^{-w} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \prod_+(\mathbf{q}) \leqslant Q\,, \tag{2}$$

where

$$\textstyle\prod\mathbf{y} := \prod(\mathbf{y}) = \displaystyle\prod_{j=1}^m |y_j| \qquad \text{and} \qquad \textstyle\prod_+(\mathbf{q}) := \displaystyle\prod_{i=1}^n \max\{1, |q_i|\}$$

for $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$. Also $\langle \mathbf{y}\rangle$ denotes the unique point in $[-1/2, 1/2)^m$ congruent to $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ modulo $\mathbb{Z}^m$. Thus, $\|\cdot\| = |\langle\,\cdot\,\rangle|$. It follows that whenever $w^\times(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is finite, the inequality

$$\textstyle\prod\langle \boldsymbol{X}\mathbf{q} + \boldsymbol{\theta}\rangle < \prod_+(\mathbf{q})^{-w}$$

has infinitely many solutions $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ if $w < w^\times(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and has at most finitely many solutions $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ if $w > w^\times(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$.

The homogeneous theory of Diophantine approximation corresponds to the special case of $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{0}$ in the above inequalities. In this case the associated homogeneous exponents will be denoted by $w(\boldsymbol{X}) := w(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathbf{0})$ and $w^{\times}(\boldsymbol{X}) := w^{*}(\boldsymbol{X}, \mathbf{0})$. A trivial consequence of Dirichlet's theorem [36], or simply the 'pigeon-hole principle', is that

$$w(\boldsymbol{X}) \geqslant 1 \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}\,. \tag{3}$$

Also it is readily seen that (1) implies (2) and therefore

$$w^{\times}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geqslant w(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n} \text{ and all } \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{m}\,. \tag{4}$$

The Diophantine exponents can in principle be infinite. Nevertheless, a relatively straightforward consequence of the Borel-Cantelli lemma from probability theory is that (3) is reversed for almost all $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ with respect to Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ and moreover that

$$w^{\times}(\boldsymbol{X}) = 1 \qquad \text{for almost all } \boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}\,. \tag{5}$$

For completeness, we mention that $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ is said to be very well approximable (see [29, 36]) if $w(\boldsymbol{X}) > 1$ and multiplicatively very well approximable (see [29]) if $w^{\times}(\boldsymbol{X}) > 1$. Note that in view of the discussion above, the corresponding sets of very well approximable and multiplicatively very well approximable points are of zero Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$.

1.2 Homogeneous theory

Sprindzuk [39] conjectured that (5) remains true when $\boldsymbol{X}$ is restricted to any analytic non-degenerate submanifold $\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ identified with either columns $\mathbb{R}^{n\times 1}$ (*simultaneous Diophantine approximation*) or rows $\mathbb{R}^{1\times n}$ (*dual Diophantine approximation*) with respect to the Riemannian measure on $\mathcal{M}$. This conjecture had been previously stated by A. Baker [3] for Veronese curves $\mathcal{V}_n := \{(x, \dots, x^n),\ x \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Essentially, non-degenerate manifolds are smooth submanifolds of $\mathbb{R}^n$ which are sufficiently curved so that they deviate from any hyperplane with a 'power law' [4]. For the formal definition see [29]. Any real, connected analytic manifold not contained in a hyperplane of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is non-degenerate. For a planar curve, the non-degeneracy condition is simply equivalent to the condition that the curvature is non-vanishing almost everywhere.

Baker-Sprindzuk conjecture. *For any analytic non-degenerate submanifold $\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$*

$$w^{\times}(\boldsymbol{X}) = 1 \qquad \textit{for almost all } \boldsymbol{X} \in \mathcal{M}\,. \tag{6}$$

Note that in view of (3) and (4), the Baker-Sprindzuk conjecture implies that

$$w(\boldsymbol{X}) = 1 \qquad \text{for almost all } \boldsymbol{X} \in \mathcal{M}\,. \tag{7}$$

In fact, this weaker statement also appears as a formal conjecture in [39]. In the case of the Veronese curves $\mathcal{V}_n$, (7) reduces to Mahler's problem [31] and statement (6) reduces to the specific conjecture of A. Baker mentioned above. Manifolds that satisfy (7) are referred to as *extremal* and manifolds that satisfy (6) are referred to as *strongly extremal.* To be precise, either notion of extremality actually takes on two forms depending on whether $\mathbb{R}^n$ is identified with $\mathbb{R}^{n\times 1}$ or $\mathbb{R}^{1\times n}$. However, by Khintchine's transference principle both forms are equivalent and it is pointless to distinguish between them. A priori, this is not the case when considering 'extremality' within the inhomogeneous setting – see §1.3.

Until 1998, progress on the Baker-Sprindzuk conjecture was limited to special classes of manifolds – see [15, 38]. Restricting our attention to non-degenerate curves, the weaker form of the conjecture corresponding to (7) had been established for planar curves by W.M. Schmidt [34] and by Beresnevich & Bernik [5] for curves in $\mathbb{R}^3$. The actual conjecture had only been established for the Veronese curves $\mathcal{V}_n$ with $n \leqslant 3$ by Yu [42] and with $n = 4$ by Bernik & Borbat [12]. In their ground breaking work, Kleinbock & Margulis [29] established the Baker-Sprindzuk conjecture in full generality and moreover removed the 'analytic' assumption.

Theorem KM *Any non-degenerate submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is strongly extremal.*

The work of Kleinbock & Margulis has led to various generalisations of the Baker-Sprindzuk conjecture. Kleinbock [25] has established that non-degenerate submanifolds of strongly extremal affine subspaces of $\mathbb{R}^n$ are strongly extremal. He has also shown that non-degenerate complex analytic manifolds are strongly extremal [26]. Kleinbock & Tomanov [28] have generalised Theorem KM to the S-arithmetic setting. Kleinbock, Lindenstrauss & Weiss [27] have revolutionised the notion of extremality by introducing the concept of measures being extremal rather than sets. Let μ be a measure supported on a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. We say that μ is *extremal* if $w(\boldsymbol{X}) = 1$ for μ-almost every point $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. In other words, the set of $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ for which $w(\boldsymbol{X}) > 1$ is of μ-measure zero. We say that μ is *strongly extremal* if $w^\times(\boldsymbol{X}) = 1$ for μ-almost every point $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. Furthermore, if μ is a measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ then μ is *(strongly) extremal* if it is (strongly) extremal through the identification of $\mathbb{R}^n$ with either $\mathbb{R}^{n\times 1}$ or $\mathbb{R}^{1\times n}$. In view of Khintchine's transference principle, there is no difference which representation of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is taken.

The following constitutes the main result of Kleinbock, Lindenstrauss & Weiss [27].

Theorem KLW *Any friendly measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is strongly extremal.*

The definition of *friendly* measures is given in §2. At this point it suffices to say that friendly measures form a large and natural class of measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$ including Riemannian measures supported on non-degenerate manifolds, fractal measures supported on self-similar sets satisfying the open set condition (e.g. regular Cantor sets, Koch snowflake, Sierpinski gasket) and conformal measures supported on limit sets of Kleinian groups. In view of the former we have that

$$\text{Theorem KLW} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \text{Theorem KM.}$$

1.3 Inhomogeneous theory

The central goal of this paper is to establish the inhomogeneous analogue of the Baker-Sprindzuk conjecture. Naturally, we begin by introducing the notion of extremality in the inhomogeneous theory of Diophantine approximation.

Definition 1 (Measures on $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$) Let μ be a measure supported on a subset of $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. We say that μ is *inhomogeneously extremal* if for all $\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathbb{R}^m$

$$w(\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{\theta})=1 \qquad \text{for } \mu\text{-almost all } \boldsymbol{X}\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}. \tag{8}$$

We say that μ is *inhomogeneously strongly extremal* if for all $\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathbb{R}^m$

$$w^{\times}(\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{\theta})=1 \qquad \text{for } \mu\text{-almost all } \boldsymbol{X}\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}. \tag{9}$$

These notions of extremality naturally generalise the homogenous ones which only require (8) and (9) to hold for $\boldsymbol{\theta}=\mathbf{0}$. A remark regarding the use of the word *strongly* in the definition of 'inhomogeneously strongly extremal' is in order. In the homogeneous case, (3) and (4) with $\boldsymbol{\theta}=\mathbf{0}$ show that strong extremality implies extremality – exactly as one would expect. In the inhomogeneous case there is no analogue of (3) and it is not at all obvious that strong extremality implies extremality. However, the following result established in §3.1 justifies the use of the word 'strongly' even in the inhomogeneous case.

Proposition 1 *Let μ be a measure on $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. Then*

$$\mu \text{ is inhomogeneously strongly extremal} \quad\Longrightarrow\quad \mu \text{ is inhomogeneously extremal}.$$

As already mentioned, there are two different forms of Diophantine approximation when approximating points in $\mathbb{R}^n$ depending on whether $\mathbb{R}^n$ is identified with $\mathbb{R}^{n\times 1}$ or $\mathbb{R}^{1\times n}$. The identification with the former corresponds to the simultaneous form and the latter corresponds to the dual form. As a consequence of Khintchine's transference principle, the two forms of approximation lead to equivalent notions of extremality in the homogeneous case. However, Khintchine's transference principle is not applicable in the inhomogeneous case and the simultaneous and dual forms of extremality are not necessarily equivalent. Consequently, the two forms of extremality need to be considered separately.

Definition 2 (Measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$) Let μ be a measure supported on a subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. If μ is inhomogeneously (strongly) extremal on $\mathbb{R}^{1\times n}$ we say that μ is *dually inhomogeneously (strongly) extremal*. If μ is inhomogeneously (strongly) extremal on $\mathbb{R}^{n\times 1}$ we say that μ is *simultaneously inhomogeneously (strongly) extremal*. If μ is both dually and simultaneously inhomogeneously (strongly) extremal then we simply say that μ is *inhomogeneously (strongly) extremal*.

Naturally, a manifold $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is called *inhomogeneously (strongly) extremal* if the Riemannian measure on $\mathcal{M}$ is inhomogeneously (strongly) extremal. The Veronese curves $\mathcal{V}_n$ have been shown to be dually inhomogeneously extremal in the real [13], complex [41], p-adic [14, 40] and 'mixed' [17] cases. These results are natural generalisations of Mahler's conjecture to the inhomogeneous setting. Most recently, Badziahin [1] has extended Schmidt's homogeneous result [34] by showing that non-degenerate planar curves are dually inhomogeneously extremal. Strikingly this constitutes the only known result beyond the Veronese curves. However, one would expect that an inhomogeneous analogue of Theorem KM holds in full generality.

Inhomogeneous Baker-Sprindzuk conjecture. *Any non-degenerate submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is inhomogeneously strongly extremal.*

In view of Proposition 1, this implies the weaker conjecture that *any non-degenerate submanifold $\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is inhomogeneously extremal.* As discussed above the weaker conjecture is known to be true for Veronese curves. Regarding the stronger conjecture nothing is known. Nevertheless, given Theorem KLW, it is natural to broaden the conjecture to friendly measures.

Conjecture. *Any friendly measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is inhomogeneously strongly extremal.*

1.4 Statement of results

Let μ be a non-atomic, locally finite, Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. Obviously, we have that

$$\mu \text{ is inhomogeneously (strongly) extremal} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \mu \text{ is (strongly) extremal.}$$

The right hand side corresponds to the special choice of $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{0}$ in the definition of inhomogeneously (strongly) extremal. In this paper we show that the above implication is reversed for a large class of measures.

Theorem 1 *Let μ be a measure on $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$.*

(A) *If μ is contracting almost everywhere then*

$$\mu \textit{ is extremal} \iff \mu \textit{ is inhomogeneously extremal.}$$

(B) *If μ is strongly contracting almost everywhere then*

$$\mu \textit{ is strongly extremal} \iff \mu \textit{ is inhomogeneously strongly extremal.}$$

So as to avoid introducing various technical notions at this point, the definition of contracting measures is postponed to the next section. It suffices to say that friendly measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$ fall within the class of strongly contracting measures. Thus, Theorem 1B (part (B) of Theorem 1) together with Theorem KLW establishes the conjecture stated above for friendly measures.

Theorem 2 *Any friendly measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is inhomogeneously strongly extremal.*

Riemannian measures supported on non-degenerate manifolds are know to be friendly [27]. Thus, Theorem 2 gives a complete inhomogeneous analogue of Theorem KM and thereby settles the inhomogeneous Baker-Sprindzuk conjecture.

Theorem 3 *Any non-degenerate submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is inhomogeneously strongly extremal.*

It is worth mentioning that the class of contracting measures is not limited to friendly measures. To illustrate this we restrict our attention to simultaneous Diophantine approximation. Thus, $\mathbb{R}^n$ is identified with $\mathbb{R}^{n\times 1}$. In §2.3, we show that the Riemannian measure on an arbitrary differentiable submanifold $\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ falls within the class of contracting measures and indeed within the class of strongly contracting measure if a mild condition is imposed on $\mathcal{M}$. However, affine subspaces of $\mathbb{R}^n$ are differentiable manifolds and for obvious reasons they do not support friendly measures. Specializing Theorem 1 to differentiable manifolds gives the following statement.

Theorem 4 *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a differentiable submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then*

(A) $\mathcal{M}$ *is extremal* $\iff$ $\mathcal{M}$ *is simultaneously inhomogeneously extremal.*

Furthermore, suppose that at almost every point on $\mathcal{M}$ the tangent plane is not orthogonal to any of the coordinate axes. Then

(B) $\mathcal{M}$ *is strongly extremal* $\iff$ $\mathcal{M}$ *is simultaneously inhomogeneously strongly extremal.*

Recall, that the left hand side of the above implications are homogeneous statements and the notions of simultaneously and dually (strongly) extremal coincide. Examples of (strongly) extremal differentiable submanifolds that do not fall within the remit of Theorem 2 are given in [6, 25, 34]. Thus, Theorem 4 is not vacuous.

The following diagram summarizes the connections between the various notions of extremality for strongly contracting measures on $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mu \text{ is extremal} \arrow[r, Leftrightarrow, "\text{Theorem 1A}"] & \mu \text{ is inhomogeneously extremal} \\
\mu \text{ is strongly extremal} \arrow[u, Rightarrow, "\text{(L)}"] \arrow[r, Leftrightarrow, "\text{Theorem 1B}"] & \mu \text{ is inhomogeneously strongly extremal} \arrow[u, Rightarrow, "\text{(R)}"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

As mentioned in §1.3 the implication (L) is well known. Thus, for contracting measures the implication (R) follows via Theorem 1 and is independent of Proposition 1.

The upshot of Theorem 1 is that it enables us to transfer homogeneous extremality statements to inhomogeneous ones. This 'inhomogeneous transference' is rather surprising as the inhomogeneous theory contains the homogeneous theory and so is more general. In §5, we develop an abstract framework within which we establish a general inhomogeneous transference principle – namely Theorem 5. The key step in establishing Theorem 1 follows as an application of this inhomogeneous transference principle.

Remark. A direct and self-contained proof of Theorem 4A can be found in our recent article [10]. The main motivation behind [10] is to foreground and significantly simplify the key ideas involved in establishing the inhomogeneous transference principle of §5. Indeed, anyone interested in the proof of Theorem 5 and thus Theorem 1 may find it useful first to look at [10].

2 Contracting and friendly measures

In this section we start by formally introducing the class of 'contracting' measures alluded to in Theorem 1 above. We then show that friendly measures are contracting and that the Riemannian measure on a differentiable submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^{n\times 1}$ is contracting. This establishes Theorems 2 and 4 from Theorem 1.

2.1 Contracting measures

We begin by recalling some standard notions. If B is a ball in a metric space Ω then cB denotes the ball with the same centre as B and radius c times the radius of B. A measure μ on Ω is *non-atomic* if the measure of any point in Ω is zero. The *support* of μ is the smallest closed set $\boldsymbol{S}$ such $\mu(\Omega\setminus\boldsymbol{S})=0$. Also, recall that μ is *doubling* if there is a constant $\lambda>1$ such that for any ball B with centre in $\boldsymbol{S}$

$$\mu(2B)\ \leqslant\ \lambda\,\mu(B)\,. \tag{10}$$

The class of contracting measures μ is defined via the behavior of μ near planes in $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. More precisely, the planes are given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}:=\{\boldsymbol{X}\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}:\boldsymbol{X}\mathbf{a}+\mathbf{b}=\mathbf{0}\}\qquad\text{with}\quad \mathbf{a}\in\mathbb{R}^{n},\quad |\mathbf{a}|_2=1\quad\text{and}\quad \mathbf{b}\in\mathbb{R}^{m}\,, \tag{11}$$

where $|\cdot|_2$ is the Euclidean norm. Given $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}=(\varepsilon_1,\dots,\varepsilon_m)\in(0,+\infty)^m$, the $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$-neighborhood of the plane $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{L}^{(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}:=\{\boldsymbol{X}\in\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}:|\boldsymbol{X}_j\mathbf{a}+b_j|<\varepsilon_j\ \ \forall\ j=1,\dots,m\}\,, \tag{12}$$

where $\boldsymbol{X}_j$ is the j-th row of $\boldsymbol{X}$. In the case that $\varepsilon_1=\dots=\varepsilon_m=\varepsilon$, we simply write $\mathcal{L}^{(\varepsilon)}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$ for the symmetric ε-neighborhood of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$.

Definition 3 A non-atomic, finite, doubling Borel measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ is *strongly contracting* if there exist positive constants C, α and r_0 such that for any plane $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$, any $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1,\ldots,\varepsilon_m) \in (0,+\infty)^m$ with $\min\{\varepsilon_j : 1 \leqslant j \leqslant m\} < r_0$ and any $\delta \in (0,1)$ the following property is satisfied: for all $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}^{(\delta\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})} \cap \boldsymbol{S}$ there is an open ball B centred at $\boldsymbol{X}$ such that

$$B \cap \boldsymbol{S} \subset \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}^{(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})} \tag{13}$$

and

$$\mu(5B \cap \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}^{(\delta\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})}) \leqslant C\delta^\alpha \mu(5B)\,. \tag{14}$$

The measure μ is said to be *contracting* if the property holds with $\varepsilon_1 = \cdots = \varepsilon_m = \varepsilon$.

Remark. The property given by (13) and (14) indicates the rate at which the μ-measure of the $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$-neighborhood of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$ decreases when contracted by the multiplicative factor δ. Also, note that

$$\mu \text{ is strongly contracting} \quad\Longrightarrow\quad \mu \text{ is contracting.}$$

The definition of (strongly) contracting is in essence a global statement – the ‘property’ is required to hold for all $\boldsymbol{X}$ in the support $\boldsymbol{S}$. However, with the view of establishing ‘extremality’ results such as Theorem 1, sets of μ-measure zero are irrelevant and the notion of (strongly) contracting almost everywhere suffices. Formally, we say that μ is *(strongly) contracting almost everywhere* if for μ-almost every point $\boldsymbol{X}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ there is a neighborhood U of $\boldsymbol{X}_0$ such that the restriction $\mu|_U$ of μ to U is (strongly) contracting.

2.2 Friendly measures

The notion of friendly measures introduced in [27] identifies purely geometric conditions on measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$ that are sufficient to guarantee strong extremality. The class of friendly measures is defined via the behavior of μ near hyperplanes $\mathcal{L}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Let μ be a Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and as usual let $\boldsymbol{S}$ denote the support of μ. We say that μ is *non-planar* if $\mu(\mathcal{L}) = 0$ for any hyperplane $\mathcal{L}$. Furthermore, given $\mathcal{L}$ and a ball B with $\mu(B) > 0$, let $\|d_{\mathcal{L}}\|_{\mu,B}$ be the supremum of $\mathrm{dist}(\mathbf{x},\mathcal{L})$ over $\mathbf{x} \in \boldsymbol{S}\cap B$. Here $\mathrm{dist}(\mathbf{x},\mathcal{L})$ is the Euclidean distance of $\mathbf{x}$ from $\mathcal{L}$. Next, let U be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Given positive numbers C and α, the measure μ is called (C,α)-*decaying on* U if for any non-empty open ball $B \subset U$ centred in $\boldsymbol{S}$, any affine hyperplane $\mathcal{L}$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$ one has that

$$\mu(B \cap \mathcal{L}^{(\varepsilon)}) \leqslant C\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\|d_{\mathcal{L}}\|_{\mu,B}}\right)^\alpha \mu(B)\,. \tag{15}$$

Definition 4 A non-atomic, Borel measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is called *friendly* if for μ-almost every point $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ there is a neighborhood U of $\mathbf{x}_0$ such that the restriction $\mu|_U$ of μ to U is finite, doubling, non-planar and (C,α)-decaying for some positive C and α.

In the next two sections we shall establish that friendly measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$ identified either with $\mathbb{R}^{1\times n}$ or $\mathbb{R}^{n\times 1}$ are strongly contracting.

2.2.1 Friendly measures on $\mathbb{R}^{m\times 1}$

Proposition 2 *Any friendly measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^{m\times 1}$ is strongly contracting almost everywhere.*

Proof. Let μ be a friendly measure on $\mathbb{R}^m$ identified with $\mathbb{R}^{m\times 1}$. Then for μ-almost every point $\boldsymbol{X}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times 1}$ there is a neighborhood U of $\boldsymbol{X}_0$ such that $\mu|_U$ is (C,α)-decaying on U for some fixed $C,\alpha > 0$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\mu = \mu|_U$. The fact that μ is non-planar, implies that there are $n+1$ linearly independent points $\boldsymbol{X}_0,\dots,\boldsymbol{X}_n$ in the support $\boldsymbol{S}$ of μ. This ensures that there exists a real number $r_0 > 0$ such that no single rectangle with shortest side of length $\leqslant 2r_0$ contains $\boldsymbol{S}$. Also, note that since $\mathbb{R}^m$ is identified with $\mathbb{R}^{m\times 1}$, the set $\mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}$ appearing in the definition of strongly contracting is simply a point. Thus, for any point $\mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}$ the $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$-neighborhood given by $(12)_{n=1}$ is a rectangle with sides of length $2\varepsilon_i$ $(i = 1,\dots,m)$. In particular, if $\min_{1\leqslant j\leqslant m}\varepsilon_j < r_0$ then

$$\boldsymbol{S} \not\subset \mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}^{(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})}\,. \tag{16}$$

Fix $\delta \in (0,1)$ and take any point $\boldsymbol{X} \in \boldsymbol{S}\cap\mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}^{(\delta\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that this intersection is non-empty. The goal is to construct a ball B centred at $\boldsymbol{X}$ satisfying (13) and (14) in the definition of strongly contracting. To start with, let B' be an arbitrary ball centred at $\boldsymbol{X}$ such that

$$B' \subset \mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}^{(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})}\,. \tag{17}$$

This is possible as $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}^{(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})}$ and by definition $\mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}^{(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})}$ is an open set. By (16) and (17), there is a real number $\tau \geqslant 1$ such that

$$5\tau B' \cap \boldsymbol{S} \not\subset \mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}^{(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \tau B' \cap \boldsymbol{S} \subset \mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}^{(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})}\,. \tag{18}$$

By (18), there exists a point $\boldsymbol{X}' \in \Big(5\tau B' \cap \boldsymbol{S}\Big) \setminus \mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}^{(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})}$. By the choice of $\boldsymbol{X}'$, there exists a $j \in \{1,\dots,m\}$ such that

$$\left|X'_j + b_j\right| \geqslant \varepsilon_j\,. \tag{19}$$

Recall that X'_j and b_j are the j-th coordinates of $\boldsymbol{X}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ respectively. With reference to § 2.2, let $\mathcal{L}$ be given by $X_j + b_j = 0$ and $B = 5\tau B'$. It follows from (19) that $\|d_{\mathcal{L}}\|_{\mu,B} \geqslant \varepsilon_j$. Since μ is (C,α)-decaying, (15) with $\varepsilon := \delta\varepsilon_j$ implies that

$$\mu(5\tau B' \cap \mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}^{(\delta\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})}) \;\leqslant\; \mu(5\tau B' \cap \mathcal{L}^{(\delta\varepsilon_j)}) \;<\; C\left(\frac{\delta\varepsilon_j}{\varepsilon_j}\right)^{\alpha}\mu(5\tau B') \;=\; C\,\delta^{\alpha}\mu(5\tau B')\,.$$

The upshot of this is that the ball $\tau B'$ satisfies conditions (13) and (14). The other conditions of strongly contracting are trivially met and the proof is complete.

⊠

2.2.2 Friendly measures on $\mathbb{R}^{1\times n}$

Proposition 3 *Any friendly measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^{1\times n}$ is strongly contracting almost everywhere.*

Proof. Let μ be a friendly measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ identified with $\mathbb{R}^{1\times n}$. Then for μ-almost every point $\boldsymbol{X}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{1\times n}$ there is a neighborhood U of $\boldsymbol{X}_0$ such that $\mu|_U$ is (C,α)-decaying on U for some fixed constants $C, \alpha > 0$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\mu = \mu|_U$. The fact that μ is non-planar, implies that there are $n+1$ linearly independent points $\boldsymbol{X}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{X}_n$ in the support $\boldsymbol{S}$ of μ. This ensures that there exists a real number $r_0 > 0$ such that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, r_0)$ and any hyperplane $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a},b}$ the ε-neighborhood given by $(12)_{m=1}$ cannot contain all the points $\boldsymbol{X}_0, \ldots, \boldsymbol{X}_n$. It follows that for any hyperplane and $0 < \varepsilon < r_0$, we have that

$$\boldsymbol{S} \not\subset \mathcal{L}^{(\varepsilon)}_{\mathbf{a},b}\ . \tag{20}$$

Fix $\delta \in (0,1)$ and take any point $\boldsymbol{X} \in \boldsymbol{S} \cap \mathcal{L}^{(\delta\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})}_{a,\mathbf{b}}$ – we may as well assume that this intersection is non-empty. Now, let B' be an arbitrary ball centred at $\boldsymbol{X}$ such that

$$B' \subset \mathcal{L}^{(\varepsilon)}_{\mathbf{a},b}\,. \tag{21}$$

This is possible as $\mathcal{L}^{(\varepsilon)}_{\mathbf{a},b}$ is open. By (20) and (21), there is a real number $\tau \geqslant 1$ such that

$$5\tau B' \cap \boldsymbol{S} \not\subset \mathcal{L}^{(\varepsilon)}_{\mathbf{a},b} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \tau B' \cap \boldsymbol{S} \subset \mathcal{L}^{(\varepsilon)}_{\mathbf{a},b}\,. \tag{22}$$

By (22), there exists a point $\boldsymbol{X}' \in 5\tau B' \cap \boldsymbol{S}$ which is not contained in $\mathcal{L}^{(\varepsilon)}_{\mathbf{a},b}$. With reference to § 2.2, let $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a},b}$ and $B = 5\tau B_0$. It follows that $\|d_{\mathcal{L}}\|_{\mu,B} \geqslant \varepsilon$ which together with (15) implies that

$$\mu\big(5\tau B' \cap \mathcal{L}^{(\delta\varepsilon)}_{\mathbf{a},b}\big) \ \leqslant\ C\ \delta^{\alpha}\ \mu\big(5\tau B'\big)\,.$$

Thus, the ball $\tau B'$ satisfies conditions (13) and (14) in the definition of strongly contracting. The other conditions of strongly contracting are trivially met and the proof is complete.

$\boxtimes$

2.3 Differentiable manifolds: Proof of Theorem 4

We begin by establishing Theorem 4B - part (B) of Theorem 4. Clearly, we only have to prove the necessity part as the right hand side of the statement contains the left hand side. Thus, we are given that the differentiable submanifold $\mathcal{M}$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ is strongly extremal. Let m denote the Riemannian measure on $\mathcal{M}$. The aim is to show that m is inhomogeneously strongly extremal on $\mathbb{R}^{n\times 1}$ – see Definition 2 in §1.3. This is a simple consequence of Theorem 1B once we have established that m as a measure on $\mathbb{R}^{n\times 1}$ is strongly contracting almost everywhere.

Take any point $\mathbf{y}_0 \in \mathcal{M}$ such that the tangent plane to $\mathcal{M}$ at $\mathbf{y}_0$ is not orthogonal to any of the coordinate axes. Since the latter property holds almost everywhere on $\mathcal{M}$, it suffices to prove Theorem 4B for a neighborhood $\mathcal{P}$ of $\mathbf{y}_0$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that there is a $C^{(1)}$ local parameterisation of $\mathcal{P}$ given by $\mathbf{f} : U \to \mathcal{M}$. Here U is a ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$ centred at $\mathbf{x}_0 \in U$ such that $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0) = \mathbf{y}_0$ and $d = \dim \mathcal{M}$. By the condition on $\mathbf{y}_0$ imposed above, there is a direction $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that the tangent direction $\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0)}{\partial \mathbf{v}}$ is not orthogonal to any of the coordinate axes. This means that there exists some $\kappa > 0$, such that

$$2\kappa^{-1} < \left| \frac{\partial f_i(\mathbf{x}_0)}{\partial \mathbf{v}} \right| < \kappa/2 \qquad \text{for all } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n.$$

Since $\mathbf{f}$ is $C^{(1)}$, there exists a sufficiently small ball $B_0 \subset U$ centered at $\mathbf{x}_0$ such that

$$\kappa^{-1} < \left| \frac{\partial f_i(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{v}} \right| < \kappa \qquad \text{for all } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n \text{ and all } \mathbf{x} \in B_0. \tag{23}$$

Without loss of generality, take $f(B_0)$ to be the neighborhood $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{M}$ of $\mathbf{y}_0$ mentioned above. We now slice B_0 with respect to the direction $\mathbf{v}$ so as to reduce the problem at hand to one concerning differentiable curves. Since $\mathcal{M}$ is strongly extremal and using the fact that sets of full measure are invariant under diffeomorphisms, the set

$$\mathcal{E} := \{\mathbf{x} \in B_0 : w^{\times}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) = 1\}$$

has full Lebesgue measure in B_0. Now for any $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ orthogonal to $\mathbf{v}$, consider the line $L_{\mathbf{x}'}$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ given by

$$L_{\mathbf{x}'} := \{\mathbf{x} = x\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^d : x \in \mathbb{R}\}.$$

Also, let

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{x}'} := \mathcal{E} \cap L_{\mathbf{x}'} \qquad \text{and} \qquad B_{\mathbf{x}'} := B_0 \cap L_{\mathbf{x}'}.$$

Clearly, $B_{\mathbf{x}'}$ is either an interval or is empty and $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{x}'} \subset B_{\mathbf{x}'}$. For obvious reasons, we only consider the situation when $B_{\mathbf{x}'} \neq \emptyset$. Since $\mathcal{E}$ has full measure in B_0, it follows from Fubini's theorem that for almost every $\mathbf{x}'$ the slice $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{x}'}$ has full measure in $B_{\mathbf{x}'}$. Now let $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{x}'}$ denote the map $\mathbf{f}$ restricted to $B_{\mathbf{x}'}$. Clearly, $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{x}'}$ is a diffeomorphism from $B_{\mathbf{x}'}$ onto the curve

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{x}'} := \mathbf{f}(B_{\mathbf{x}'}).$$

Since $\mathcal{E}_{\mathbf{x}'}$ has full measure in $B_{\mathbf{x}'}$ and $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{x}'}$ is a diffeomorphism, $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{x}'}$ is strongly extremal for almost all $\mathbf{x}'$ orthogonal to the direction $\mathbf{v}$.

Now we fix any $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^d$ orthogonal to $\mathbf{v}$ such that the curve $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{x}'}$ is non-empty and strongly extremal. Define the map $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \ldots, g_n) : I \to \mathbb{R}^n$ from the interval

$$I := \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{x}' \in B_0\}$$

such that $\mathbf{g}(x) = \mathbf{f}(x\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{x}')$. By (23), we have that

$$\kappa^{-1} \leqslant |g_i'(x)| \leqslant \kappa \qquad \text{for all } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n \text{ and all } x \in I. \tag{24}$$

Let μ denote the induced Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{C}$ and identify $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathbb{R}^{n\times 1}$. The key part of the proof is to that show that μ as a measure on $\mathbb{R}^{n\times 1}$ is strongly contracting. This involves verifying (13) and (14). Regarding (14) we can assume that $\delta < 1/2$ as otherwise (14) is trivially satisfied with $C > 2$. Also, given that $\mathbb{R}^n$ is being identified with $\mathbb{R}^{n\times 1}$, the set $\mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}$ appearing in the definition of strongly contracting is simply a point. Now choose a real number $r_0 > 0$ so that for any point $\mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_n) \in (0, +\infty)^n$ with $\min_{1\leqslant j\leqslant n} \varepsilon_j < r_0$, we have that

$$\mathcal{C} \not\subset \mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}^{(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})} .$$

The latter is readily deduced from (24). In what follows we fix a point $\mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}$, a vector $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ with $0 < \min_{1\leqslant j\leqslant n} \varepsilon_j < r_0$ and a $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\varepsilon_1 \leqslant \ldots \leqslant \varepsilon_n$ and that $\mu(\mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}^{(\delta\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})} \cap \mathcal{C}) \neq 0$. We now verify that

$$\mu(\mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}^{(\delta\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})} \cap \mathcal{C}) \leqslant 2\sqrt{n}\kappa^2\delta\varepsilon_1 . \tag{25}$$

Let $\boldsymbol{X}$ and $\boldsymbol{X}'$ be any two points in $\mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}^{(\delta\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})} \cap \mathcal{C}$. Thus, $\boldsymbol{X} = \mathbf{g}(x)$ and $\boldsymbol{X}' = \mathbf{g}(x')$ for some $x, x' \in I$. It follows that

$$|g_1(x) - b_1/a| < \delta\varepsilon_1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad |g_1(x') - b_1/a| < \delta\varepsilon_1 , \tag{26}$$

where b_1 is the first coordinate of $\mathbf{b}$ associated with the point $\mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}$ and g_1 is the first coordinate function of $\mathbf{g}$. By the Mean Value theorem, there exists some $\theta \in [0, 1]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |(g_1(x) - b_1/a) - (g_1(x') - b_1/a)| &= |g_1(x) - g_1(x')| \\ &= |x - x'| \left|g_1'\big(\theta x + (1-\theta')x'\big)\right| . \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

By (24), (26) and (27), it follows that

$$|x - x'| \leqslant 2\kappa\delta\varepsilon_1 . \tag{28}$$

In view of (24), g_i is monotonic for every i and therefore the set $\mathbf{g}^{-1}(\mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}^{(\delta\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})} \cap \mathcal{C}) \subset I$ is an interval. Let x_0 and x_1 be the endpoints of this interval with $x_0 < x_1$. Clearly, (28) is valid with $x = x_0$ and $x' = x_1$. Therefore,

$$\mu(\mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}^{(\delta\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})} \cap \mathcal{C}) = \int_{x_0}^{x_1} |\mathbf{g}'(x)| dx \overset{(24)}{\leqslant} \sqrt{n}\kappa|x_0 - x_1| \overset{(28)}{\leqslant} \sqrt{n}\kappa 2\kappa\delta\varepsilon_1 .$$

This is precisely (25). Now, let B be a ball centred at $\boldsymbol{X}$ of radius $\varepsilon_1/2$. By the choice of $\boldsymbol{X}$ and the fact that $\delta < 1/2$, we have that

$$B \subset \mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}^{(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})}. \tag{29}$$

By the Mean Value Theorem and (24), for any $x \in I' := \{x' \in I : |x - x'| < \varepsilon_1/(2\sqrt{n}\kappa)\}$ we have that

$$|\mathbf{g}(x') - \mathbf{g}(x)| = |\mathbf{g}'(\theta' x' + (1-\theta')x)|\, |x - x'| < \varepsilon_1/2 .$$

It follows that $\mathbf{g}(x') \in B$ for any $x' \in I'$ and that $|I'| \geqslant \varepsilon_1/(2\sqrt{n}\kappa)$. Hence,

$$\mu(5B \cap \mathcal{C}) \geqslant \mu(B \cap \mathcal{C}) \geqslant \int_{I'} |\mathbf{g}'(x)| dx \overset{(24)}{\geqslant} \kappa\sqrt{n}/2 \cdot |I'| \geqslant \varepsilon_1/4\,. \tag{30}$$

On combining inequalities (25) and (30), we obtain that

$$\mu(5B \cap \mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}^{(\delta\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})} \cap \mathcal{C}) \leqslant \mu(\mathcal{L}_{a,\mathbf{b}}^{(\delta\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})} \cap \mathcal{C}) \leqslant 2\sqrt{n}\kappa^2\delta\varepsilon_1 \leqslant 8\sqrt{n}\kappa^2\delta\,\mu(5B \cap \mathcal{C})\,. \tag{31}$$

Clearly, (29) verifies (13) and (31) verifies (14). Thus, the measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^{n\times 1}$ is strongly contracting. By Theorem 1B, it follows that μ is inhomogeneously strongly extremal on $\mathbb{R}^{n\times 1}$. By definition, μ or equivalent $\mathcal{C}$ is simultaneously inhomogeneously strongly extremal. This establishes Theorem 4B in the case that $\mathcal{M}$ is a differentiable curve. To deal with manifolds in general, we appeal to Fubini's theorem. For any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, consider the sets

$$\mathcal{E}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}} := \{\mathbf{x} \in B_0 : w^{\times}(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}), \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{E}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{x}'} := \mathcal{E}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \cap L_{\mathbf{x}'}\ .$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{E}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{x}'} \subset B_{\mathbf{x}'}$. For almost every $\mathbf{x}'$ the measure μ on the corresponding curve $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{x}'}$ is simultaneously inhomogeneously strongly extremal. Thus, for almost every $\mathbf{x}'$ the slice $\mathcal{E}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{x}'}$ has full Lebesgue measure in $B_{\mathbf{x}'}$. Hence, by Fubini's theorem we have that $\mathcal{E}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ has full Lebesgue measure in B_0. Consequently, $\mathbf{f}(\mathcal{E}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ has full Riemannian measure in $\mathcal{P} := \mathbf{f}(B_0)$. This completes the proof of Theorem 4B.

⊠

The proof of Theorem 4A follows the same line of argument as above. However, we only require that the inequality in (23) holds for at least one value of i rather than for all i. This is the case for any differentiable manifold irrespective of the direction $\mathbf{v}$. Hence there is no extra hypothesis on $\mathcal{M}$ in Theorem 4A. The details are left to the reader. As mentioned at the end of §1.4, for a self-contained and independent proof of Theorem 4A see [10].

3 Lower bounds for Diophantine exponents

Given a measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$, suppose we are interested in establishing that μ is inhomogeneously strongly extremal. Clearly, this would follow on showing that for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$

$$w^{\times}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \leqslant 1 \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-almost all } \boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$$

and

$$w^{\times}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geqslant 1 \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-almost all } \boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}. \tag{32}$$

Establishing inhomogeneous extremality corresponds to similar statements with $w^{\times}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ replaced by $w(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$. Note that as a consequence of (3) and (4), in the homogeneous case

($\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{0}$) the set of $\boldsymbol{X}$ satisfying $w(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geqslant 1$ or $w^{\times}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geqslant 1$ is the whole space. Thus, (32) is automatically satisfied within the homogeneous setting. A priori, this is not the case within the inhomogeneous setting. The goal of this section is to establish (32) and the analogous $w(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geqslant 1$ statement for extremal measures within the inhomogeneous setting.

Proposition 4 *Let μ be an extremal measure on $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. Then for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$,*

$$w^{\times}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geqslant w(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geqslant 1 \quad \text{for } \mu\text{-almost all } \boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}\,.$$

If μ is extremal, then $w(\boldsymbol{X}) = 1$ for μ-almost all $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ and Proposition 4 readily follows from (4) and the following statement.

Lemma 1 *Let $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ such that $w(\boldsymbol{X}) = 1$. Then for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$,*

$$w(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geqslant 1\,. \tag{33}$$

The proof of the lemma utilises basic ‘transference’ inequalities relating various forms of Diophantine exponents. These we briefly describe. A form of Khintchine’s transference principle due to Dyson [36, Theorem 5C] relates the homogeneous exponents of $\boldsymbol{X}$ and its transpose ${}^t\boldsymbol{X}$. It states that

$$w(\boldsymbol{X}) = 1 \iff w({}^t\boldsymbol{X}) = 1 \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}\,. \tag{34}$$

In the spirit of Cassels [20, Chapter 5], Bugeaud & Laurent [19] have recently discovered transference inequalities that relate the Diophantine exponents $w(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ with their uniform counterparts $\widehat{w}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$. The latter are defined as followed. Given $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, let $\widehat{w}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ be the supremum of $w \geqslant 0$ such that for all sufficiently large Q there is a $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \smallsetminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ satisfying (1). As with the standard non-uniform exponents, a trivial consequence of Dirichlet’s theorem is that

$$\widehat{w}(\boldsymbol{X}) \geqslant 1 \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}\,. \tag{35}$$

Also, the following inequalities are easily verified.

$$w(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \;\geqslant\; \widehat{w}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \;\geqslant\; 0\,. \tag{36}$$

Theorem BL (Bugeaud & Laurent) *Let $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. Then for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$,*

$$w(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geqslant \frac{1}{\widehat{w}({}^t\boldsymbol{X})} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \widehat{w}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geqslant \frac{1}{w({}^t\boldsymbol{X})} \tag{37}$$

with equalities in (37) for almost all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

We are now fully armed to proceed with the proof of above lemma.

Proof of Lemma 1. We are given that $w(\boldsymbol{X}) = 1$. Hence, by (34) it follows that $w({}^t\boldsymbol{X}) = 1$. This together with (35) and $(36)_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\mathbf{0}}$ applied to ${}^t\boldsymbol{X}$ implies that $\widehat{w}({}^t\boldsymbol{X}) = 1$. In turn, this combined with (37) implies that $w(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geqslant 1$ and thereby completes the proof.

⊠

Remark 1. It is worth pointing out that Lemma 1, which allows us to deduce Proposition 4 and thereby reduce the proof of Theorem 1 to establishing upper bounds for the associated Diophantine exponents, can in fact be proved without appealing to Theorem BL. Indeed, a proof can be given which only makes use of classical transference inequalities; namely Theorem VI of Chapter 5 in [20]. Thus, the proof of Proposition 4 and therefore Theorem 1 is not actually dependent on the recent developments regarding transference inequalities.

Remark 2. Theorem BL actually gives us information beyond Lemma 1. It enables us to deduce that inequality (33) is in fact an equality for almost all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Thus, the real significance of Theorem 1A is in establishing a global result which holds for *all* $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

3.1 Proof of Proposition 1

Let μ be a measure on $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. Given that μ is inhomogeneously strongly extremal we wish to conclude that μ is inhomogeneously extremal. This as we shall now see is a simple consequence of (4) and Lemma 1.

We are given that for any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $w^\times(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = 1$ for μ-almost all $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. By (4), it follows that for any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $w(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \leqslant 1$ for μ-almost all $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. Thus, we only need to show that for any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, $w(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \geqslant 1$ for μ-almost all $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. Since μ is inhomogeneously strongly extremal we trivially have that μ is strongly extremal and therefore extremal. In other words, $w(\boldsymbol{X}) = 1$ for almost all $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. This together with Lemma 1 yields the desired statement.

⊠

4 A reformulation of Theorem 1

The goal of this section is to reformulate Theorem 1 so that the new statement can be deduced via the general framework developed in §5. On the other hand, the reformulation is natural even for a direct proof of Theorem 1 and thereby motivates the general framework.

Theorem 1 consists of two parts which we refer to as Theorem 1A and Theorem 1B. We will concentrate on establishing Theorem 1B. The proof of Theorem 1A is similar in spirit and we shall indicate the necessary modifications that need to be made.

With the intention of proving Theorem 1B, let μ be a strongly extremal measure on $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$

and define

$$\mathcal{A}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m,n} := \{\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n} : w^{\times}(\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{\theta}) > 1\}\,.$$

In view of Proposition 4, Theorem 1B is reduced to showing that

$$\mu(\mathcal{A}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m,n}) = 0 \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m\,. \tag{38}$$

The key towards establishing (38) is the following reformulation. Let $\mathbf{T}$ denote a countable subset of $\mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ such that for every $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \ldots, t_{m+n}) \in \mathbf{T}$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} t_j = \sum_{i=1}^{n} t_{m+i}\,. \tag{39}$$

For $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}$, consider the diagonal unimodular transformation $g_{\mathbf{t}}$ of $\mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ given by

$$g_{\mathbf{t}} \ := \ \operatorname{diag}\{2^{t_1}, \ldots, 2^{t_m}, 2^{-t_{m+1}}, \ldots, 2^{-t_{m+n}}\}\,. \tag{40}$$

For $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$, define the matrix

$$M_{\boldsymbol{X}} := \begin{pmatrix} I_m & \boldsymbol{X} \\ 0 & I_n \end{pmatrix},$$

where I_n and I_m are respectively the $n \times n$ and $m \times m$ identity matrices. The matrix $M_{\boldsymbol{X}}$ is a linear transformation of $\mathbb{R}^{m+n}$. Given $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$, let

$$M^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\boldsymbol{X}} \ : \ \mathbf{a} \mapsto M^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\boldsymbol{X}}\mathbf{a} := M_{\boldsymbol{X}}\mathbf{a} + \boldsymbol{\Theta}\,,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \ := \ {}^t(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$. Thus, $M^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\boldsymbol{X}}$ is an affine transformation of $\mathbb{R}^{m+n}$. Let

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{Z}^m \times (\mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\})\,. \tag{41}$$

Then, for $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ define the sets

$$\Delta^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha, \varepsilon) := \{\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n} : |g_{\mathbf{t}} M^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\boldsymbol{X}}\alpha| \ < \varepsilon\} \tag{42}$$

and

$$\Delta^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{t}}(\varepsilon) := \bigcup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \Delta^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha, \varepsilon) = \{\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n} : \inf_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} |g_{\mathbf{t}} M^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\boldsymbol{X}}\alpha| \ < \varepsilon\}\,.$$

For $\eta > 0$, define the function

$$\psi^{\eta} \ : \ \mathbf{T} \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+ \ : \ \mathbf{t} \mapsto \psi^{\eta}_{\mathbf{t}} := 2^{-\eta\sigma(\mathbf{t})} \tag{43}$$

where $\sigma(\mathbf{t}) := t_1 + \cdots + t_{m+n}$, and consider the lim sup set given by

$$\Lambda^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{T}}(\psi^{\eta}\,) \ := \ \limsup_{\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{T}} \Delta^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{t}}(\psi^{\eta}_{\mathbf{t}})\,. \tag{44}$$

In the case $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{0}$, we write $\Lambda_{\mathbf{T}}(\psi^{\eta})$ for $\Lambda^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{T}}(\psi^{\eta})$. The following result provides a reformulation of the set $\mathcal{A}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m,n}$ in terms of the lim sup sets given by (44).

Proposition 5 *There exists a countable subset* $\mathbf{T}$ *of* $\mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ *satisfying (39) such that*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{T}} 2^{-\eta\,\sigma(\mathbf{t})} < \infty \qquad \forall\, \eta > 0 \tag{45}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m,n} = \bigcup_{\eta>0} \Lambda^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{T}}(\psi^{\eta}) \qquad \forall\, \boldsymbol{\theta}\in\mathbb{R}^m\,. \tag{46}$$

Now, let μ be a measure on $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ that is strongly contracting. Then, as a consequence of (38) and Proposition 5, the proof of Theorem 1B is reduced to showing that

$$\mu(\Lambda_{\mathbf{T}}(\psi^{\eta})) = 0 \quad \forall\, \eta > 0 \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad \mu(\Lambda^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{T}}(\psi^{\eta})) = 0 \quad \forall\, \eta > 0 \tag{47}$$

for a suitable choice of $\mathbf{T}$ satisfying (39) and (45). It is worth mentioning, that in the proof of Proposition 5 an explicit choice of $\mathbf{T}$ is given.

Remark. In the case of Theorem 1A, the analogous reformulation and reduction are equally valid. The only difference is that $\mathcal{A}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m,n}$ is defined in terms of $w(\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{\theta})$ rather than $w^{\times}(\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{\theta})$.

4.1 Proof of Proposition 5

Given $\mathbf{s} = (s_1,\dots,s_m)\in\mathbb{Z}^m_+$ and $\mathbf{l} = (l_1,\dots,l_n)\in\mathbb{Z}^n_+$, let

$$\sigma(\mathbf{s}) := \sum_{j=1}^{m} s_j \ , \qquad \sigma(\mathbf{l}) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} l_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad \zeta := \zeta(\mathbf{s},\mathbf{l}) = \frac{\sigma(\mathbf{s})-\sigma(\mathbf{l})}{m+n}\ ,$$

where $\mathbb{Z}_+$ is the set of non-negative integers. Furthermore, define the $(m+n)$-tuple $\mathbf{t} = (t_1,\dots,t_{m+n})$ by setting

$$\mathbf{t} := \Big(s_1-\zeta,\dots,\ s_m-\zeta,\ l_1+\zeta,\dots,l_n+\zeta\Big) \tag{48}$$

and let

$$\mathbf{T} := \{\mathbf{t}\in\mathbb{R}^{m+n} \text{ defined by (48)} : \mathbf{s}\in\mathbb{Z}^m_+,\ \mathbf{l}\in\mathbb{Z}^n_+ \text{ with } \sigma(\mathbf{s})\geqslant\sigma(\mathbf{t})\}\,. \tag{49}$$

The goal is to show that this choice of $\mathbf{T}$ is suitable within the context of Proposition 5. Equality (39) readily follows from (48). Next, it is easily verified that for any $\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{T}$

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\,\sigma(\mathbf{t}) = \sigma(\mathbf{s}) - m\zeta = \sigma(\mathbf{l}) + n\zeta\,, \tag{50}$$

where $\sigma(\mathbf{t}) := \sum_{k=1}^{m+n} t_k$. This together with the fact that ζ is non-negative, yields that

$$\sigma(\mathbf{l}) \leqslant \tfrac{1}{2}\,\sigma(\mathbf{t}) \leqslant \sigma(\mathbf{s})\,. \tag{51}$$

Furthermore, on summing the two different expressions for $\frac{1}{2}\sigma(\mathbf{t})$ arising in (50) and using the fact that $\sigma(\mathbf{l}) \geqslant 0$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(\mathbf{t}) = \sigma(\mathbf{s}) + \sigma(\mathbf{l}) - \tfrac{m-n}{m+n}\big(\sigma(\mathbf{s}) - \sigma(\mathbf{l})\big) \ &\geqslant\ \sigma(\mathbf{s}) + \sigma(\mathbf{l}) - \tfrac{|m-n|}{m+n}\big(\sigma(\mathbf{s}) + \sigma(\mathbf{l})\big) \\ &\geqslant\ \tfrac{1}{m+n}\big(\sigma(\mathbf{s}) + \sigma(\mathbf{l})\big)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

The latter inequality establishes (45). In turn, it follows that for any $v \in \mathbb{R}_+$

$$\#\{\, \mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T} \,:\, \sigma(\mathbf{t}) \,<v\,\} \,<\, \infty\,. \tag{53}$$

Now to establish the set equality (46), fix $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$. It is easily verified that $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathcal{A}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m,n}$ if and only if there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$, such that for arbitrarily large $Q > 1$ there is an $\alpha = (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \in \mathcal{A} := \mathbb{Z}^m \times (\mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\})$ satisfying $|\boldsymbol{X}\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{p} + \boldsymbol{\theta}| \leqslant 1/2$ such that

$$\prod\big(\boldsymbol{X}\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{p} + \boldsymbol{\theta}\big) < Q^{-(1+\varepsilon)} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \prod\nolimits_+(\mathbf{q}) \leqslant Q\,. \tag{54}$$

Step 1. We show that

$$\mathcal{A}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m,n} \subseteq \bigcup_{\eta>0} \Lambda^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{T}}(\psi^{\eta})\,. \tag{55}$$

Suppose $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathcal{A}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m,n}$. It follows that (54) is satisfied for infinitely many $Q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. For any such Q, there exist unique $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{Z}^m_+$ and $\mathbf{l} \in \mathbb{Z}^n_+$ such that

$$2^{-s_j} \leqslant \max\Big\{|\boldsymbol{X}_j\,\mathbf{q} + p_j + \theta_j|\ ,\ Q^{-(1+\varepsilon)}\Big\} < 2^{-s_j+1} \qquad \text{for} \quad 1 \leqslant j \leqslant m \tag{56}$$

and

$$2^{\,l_i} \leqslant \max\{1, |q_i|\} < 2^{\,l_i+1} \qquad \text{for} \quad 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n\,. \tag{57}$$

Throughout, $\boldsymbol{X}_j := (x_{j,1}, \ldots, x_{j,n})$ denotes the j-th row of $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$. By (56) and (57), we have that

$$2^{\sigma(\mathbf{l})} \leqslant \prod\nolimits_+(\mathbf{q}) \qquad \text{and} \qquad 2^{-\sigma(\mathbf{s})} < \max\Big\{\prod\big(\boldsymbol{X}\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{p} + \boldsymbol{\theta}\big)\ ,\ Q^{-(1+\varepsilon)}\Big\}.$$

This together with (54) implies that $2^{-\sigma(\mathbf{s})} < 2^{-\sigma(\mathbf{l})(1+\varepsilon)}$. Hence,

$$\sigma(\mathbf{s}) - \sigma(\mathbf{l}) > \varepsilon\sigma(\mathbf{l}) \geqslant 0\,. \tag{58}$$

Thus, $\mathbf{t}$ given by (48) with $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \ldots, s_m)$ and $\mathbf{l} = (l_1, \ldots, l_n)$ satisfying (56) and (57) is in $\mathbf{T}$.

If $\sigma(\mathbf{s}) \leqslant 2\sigma(\mathbf{l})$, then

$$\zeta = \frac{\sigma(\mathbf{s}) - \sigma(\mathbf{l})}{m+n} \overset{(58)}{\geqslant} \frac{\varepsilon\sigma(\mathbf{l})}{m+n} \geqslant \frac{\varepsilon\sigma(\mathbf{s})}{2(m+n)} \overset{(51)}{>} \frac{\varepsilon\sigma(\mathbf{t})}{4(m+n)} .$$

If $\sigma(\mathbf{s}) > 2\sigma(\mathbf{l})$, then

$$\zeta = \frac{\sigma(\mathbf{s}) - \sigma(\mathbf{l})}{m+n} \geqslant \frac{\sigma(\mathbf{s})}{2(m+n)} \overset{(51)}{>} \frac{\sigma(\mathbf{t})}{4(m+n)} .$$

On combining the above inequalities, we deduce that

$$\zeta > \eta_0\, \sigma(\mathbf{t}) \qquad \text{with} \qquad \eta_0 := \frac{\min\{\varepsilon, 1\}}{4(m+n)} . \tag{59}$$

With reference to (40), we have that

$$g_{\mathbf{t}} = 2^{-\zeta}\, \mathrm{diag}\{2^{s_1}, \dots, 2^{s_m}, 2^{-l_1}, \dots, 2^{-l_n}\}$$

and in view of (56) and (57), it follows that

$$\inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} |g_{\mathbf{t}} M_{\boldsymbol{X}}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \alpha| < 2 \cdot 2^{-\zeta} . \tag{60}$$

For $0 < \eta < \eta_0$, (59) together with (60) implies that

$$\inf_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} |g_{\mathbf{t}} M_{\boldsymbol{X}}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \alpha| < 2^{-\eta\, \sigma(\mathbf{t})} \tag{61}$$

for all sufficiently large $\sigma(\mathbf{t})$. Note that (54) and (56) ensure that $\sigma(\mathbf{s}) \to \infty$ as $Q \to \infty$. Therefore, in view of (52) and the fact that (54) is satisfied for infinitely many $Q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we have that (61) is satisfied for infinitely many $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}$. The upshot is that $\boldsymbol{X} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{T}}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\psi^{\eta})$ for any $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$. This establishes (55).

Step 2. We show that

$$\mathcal{A}_{m,n}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \supseteq \bigcup_{\eta > 0} \Lambda_{\mathbf{T}}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\psi^{\eta}) . \tag{62}$$

Suppose $\boldsymbol{X} \in \Lambda_{\mathbf{T}}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\psi^{\eta})$ for some $\eta > 0$. By definition, (61) is satisfied for infinitely many $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}$. For any such $\mathbf{t}$, there exists $\alpha = (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$|g_{\mathbf{t}} M_{\boldsymbol{X}}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \alpha| < 2^{-\eta\sigma(\mathbf{t})} .$$

On taking the product of the first m coordinates of $g_{\mathbf{t}} M_{\boldsymbol{X}}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \alpha$, we obtain that

$$\prod_{j=1}^{m} 2^{t_j} |\boldsymbol{X}_j \mathbf{q} + p_j + \theta_j| < 2^{-m\eta\, \sigma(\mathbf{t})} .$$

Similarly, the product of the last n non-zero coordinates of $g_{\mathbf{t}}M_{\boldsymbol{X}}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\alpha$ yields that

$$\prod_{\substack{1\leqslant i\leqslant n\\ q_i\neq 0}} 2^{-t_{m+i}}\,|q_i| \,<\, 2^{-n\,\eta\,\sigma(\mathbf{t})}\,.$$

By definition, $t_{m+i} \geqslant 0$ $(1 \leqslant i \leqslant n)$ for any $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \ldots, t_{m+n}) \in \mathbf{T}$. Also, in view of (52) we have that $\sigma(\mathbf{t}) \geqslant 0$. Hence, by (39) the above displayed inequalities imply that

$$\prod\big(\boldsymbol{X}\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{p}+\boldsymbol{\theta}\big) < 2^{-m\eta\,\sigma(\mathbf{t})-\sigma(\mathbf{t})/2} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \prod\nolimits_{+}(\mathbf{q}) < 2^{\sigma(\mathbf{t})/2}\,. \tag{63}$$

By (53), we have that (63) is satisfied for arbitrarily large $\sigma(\mathbf{t})$. Now set $Q = 2^{\sigma(\mathbf{t})/2}$ and $\varepsilon := 2m\eta$. It follows that (54) is satisfied for arbitrarily large Q. The upshot is that $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathcal{A}_{m,n}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. This establishes (62).

Steps 1 and 2 establish (46) and complete the proof of Proposition 5.

⊠

Remark. With $\mathcal{A}_{m,n}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}} := \{\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n} : w(\boldsymbol{X},\boldsymbol{\theta}) > 1\}$, as is the case when dealing with Theorem 1A, the proof of Proposition 5 remains pretty much unchanged. The main difference is the manner in which we define the set $\mathbf{T}$. Given $s \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, let $\mathbf{s} := (s, \ldots, s) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m$ and $\mathbf{l} := (l \ldots, l) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$. On keeping the same notation as above, we have that $\zeta = \frac{ms-nl}{m+n}$. Furthermore, define $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \ldots, t_{m+n})$ by setting

$$\mathbf{t} := \big(\underbrace{s-\zeta, \ldots,\; s-\zeta}_{m\text{ times}},\; \underbrace{l+\zeta, \ldots, l+\zeta}_{n\text{ times}}\big) \tag{48$'$}$$

and let

$$\mathbf{T} := \{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{m+n} \text{ defined by } (48') \,:\, s \in \mathbb{Z}_+,\; l \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \text{ with } s \geqslant t\,\}\,. \tag{49$'$}$$

Note that $\mathbf{T}$ is a subset of the set defined by (49). Thus, conditions (39) and (45) are automatically satisfied for this 'smaller' choice of $\mathbf{T}$. To establish the set equality (46), we start by verifying that $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathcal{A}_{m,n}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ if and only if there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$, such that for arbitrarily large $Q > 1$ there is an $\alpha = (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \in \mathcal{A} = \mathbb{Z}^m \times (\mathbb{Z}^n \smallsetminus \{\mathbf{0}\})$ satisfying $\|\boldsymbol{X}\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{p}+\boldsymbol{\theta}\|^m < Q^{-1-\varepsilon}$ and $|\mathbf{q}|^n \leqslant Q$. These inequalities replace those appearing in (54) and by naturally modifying the arguments setout in Steps 1 and 2 above, we obtain (46).

5 An Inhomogeneous Transference Principle

In this section we develop a general framework that allows us to transfer zero measure statements for homogeneous lim sup sets to inhomogeneous lim sup sets. To a certain extent, the framework is motivated by our desire to establish the specific transference given by (47) and thereby complete the proof of Theorem 1.

Let (Ω, d) be a locally compact metric space. Given two countable 'indexing' sets $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathbf{T}$, let H and I be two maps from $\mathbf{T} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{R}^+$ into the set of open subsets of Ω such that

$$\mathrm{H} : (\mathbf{t}, \alpha, \varepsilon) \in \mathbf{T} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{R}^+ \mapsto \mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha, \varepsilon)$$

and

$$\mathrm{I} : (\mathbf{t}, \alpha, \varepsilon) \in \mathbf{T} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathbb{R}^+ \mapsto \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha, \varepsilon) .$$

Furthermore, let

$$\mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{t}}(\varepsilon) := \bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha, \varepsilon) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\varepsilon) := \bigcup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha, \varepsilon) . \tag{64}$$

Next, let $\mathbf{\Psi}$ denote a set of functions $\psi : \mathbf{T} \to \mathbb{R}^+ \; : \; \mathbf{t} \mapsto \psi_{\mathbf{t}}$. For $\psi \in \mathbf{\Psi}$, consider the lim sup sets

$$\Lambda_{\mathrm{H}}(\psi) = \limsup_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{t}}(\psi_{\mathbf{t}}) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Lambda_{\mathrm{I}}(\psi) = \limsup_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}} \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\psi_{\mathbf{t}}) . \tag{65}$$

For reasons that will soon become apparent, we refer to sets associated with the map H as homogeneous sets and those associated with the map I as inhomogeneous sets. The following 'intersection' property states that the intersection of two distinct inhomogeneous sets is contained in a homogeneous set.

The intersection property. The triple $(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{I}, \mathbf{\Psi})$ is said to satisfy *the intersection property* if for any $\psi \in \mathbf{\Psi}$, there exists $\psi^* \in \mathbf{\Psi}$ such that for all but finitely many $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}$ and all distinct α and α' in $\mathcal{A}$ we have that

$$\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha, \psi_{\mathbf{t}}) \cap \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha', \psi_{\mathbf{t}}) \subset \mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{t}}(\psi^*_{\mathbf{t}}) . \tag{66}$$

The following notion of 'contracting' is the natural generalisation of the $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ version stated in §2.1.

The contracting property. Let μ be a non-atomic, finite, doubling measure supported on a bounded subset $\boldsymbol{S}$ of Ω. We say that μ is *contracting with respect to* $(\mathrm{I}, \mathbf{\Psi})$ if for any $\psi \in \mathbf{\Psi}$ there exists $\psi^+ \in \mathbf{\Psi}$ and a sequence of positive numbers $\{k_{\mathbf{t}}\}_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}}$ satisfying

$$\sum_{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}} k_{\mathbf{t}} < \infty , \tag{67}$$

such that for all but finitely $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}$ and all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ there exists a collection $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}$ of balls B centred at $\boldsymbol{S}$ satisfying the following conditions:

$$\boldsymbol{S} \cap \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha, \psi_{\mathbf{t}}) \subset \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}} B \tag{68}$$

$$\boldsymbol{S} \cap \bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}} B \ \subset \ \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha, \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^{+}) \tag{69}$$

and

$$\mu\Big(5B \cap \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha, \psi_{\mathbf{t}})\Big) \ \leqslant \ k_{\mathbf{t}} \ \ \mu(5B) \ . \tag{70}$$

The intersection and contracting properties enable us to transfer zero μ-measure statements for the homogeneous lim sup sets $\Lambda_{\mathrm{H}}(\psi)$ to the inhomogeneous lim sup sets $\Lambda_{\mathrm{I}}(\psi)$.

Theorem 5 (Inhomogeneous Transference Principle) *Suppose that* $(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{I}, \boldsymbol{\Psi})$ *satisfies the intersection property and that* μ *is contracting with respect to* $(\mathrm{I}, \boldsymbol{\Psi})$*. Then*

$$\mu(\Lambda_{\mathrm{H}}(\psi)) = 0 \quad \forall\ \psi \in \boldsymbol{\Psi} \qquad \Longrightarrow \qquad \mu(\Lambda_{\mathrm{I}}(\psi)) = 0 \quad \forall\ \psi \in \boldsymbol{\Psi}\,. \tag{71}$$

Before proving Theorem 5, we consider an application that establishes (47) and at the same time clarifies the above abstract setup.

5.1 Completing the proof of Theorem 1

Given the Inhomogeneous Transference Principle, we are fully armed to complete the proof of Theorem 1. In view of the reformulation and reduction carried out in §4, both parts of Theorem 1 follow on establishing (47) with an appropriate choice of $\mathbf{T}$. As in §4, we will concentrate on the proof of Theorem 1B – part (B) of Theorem 1.

Throughout $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is fixed. Let μ be a measure on $\mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ that is strongly contracting almost everywhere and fix a set $\mathbf{T}$ arising from Proposition 5. In terms of establishing (47), sets of μ-measure zero are irrelevant. Therefore we can simply assume that μ is strongly contracting. We show that (47) falls within the scope of the above general framework. Let $\Omega := \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ and let $\mathcal{A}$ be given by (41). Given $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ let

$$\mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha, \varepsilon) := \Delta_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha, \varepsilon) = \Delta_{\mathbf{t}}^{\mathbf{0}}(\alpha, \varepsilon) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha, \varepsilon) := \Delta_{\mathbf{t}}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\alpha, \varepsilon),$$

where $\Delta_{\mathbf{t}}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\alpha, \varepsilon)$ is defined by (42). This defines the maps H and I associated with the general framework. It is readily seen that $\mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{t}}(\varepsilon) = \Delta_{\mathbf{t}}^{\mathbf{0}}(\varepsilon)$ and $\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\varepsilon) = \Delta_{\mathbf{t}}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\varepsilon)$. Next, let $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ be the class of functions given by (43). Then, it immediately follows that

$$\Lambda_{\mathrm{H}}(\psi) \ = \ \Lambda_{\mathbf{T}}(\psi) := \Lambda_{\mathbf{T}}^{\mathbf{0}}(\psi) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Lambda_{\mathrm{I}}(\psi) \ = \ \Lambda_{\mathbf{T}}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\psi) \ ,$$

where the set $\Lambda_{\mathbf{T}}^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\psi)$ is defined by (44). The upshot is that (47) and (71) are precisely the same statement. In view of the Inhomogeneous Transference Principle, it follows that (47) is a consequence of verifying that $(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{I}, \boldsymbol{\Psi})$ satisfies the intersection property and that μ is contracting with respect to $(\mathrm{I}, \boldsymbol{\Psi})$.

Verifying the intersection property. Let $\psi \in \mathbf{\Psi}$. This means that $\psi_{\mathbf{t}} = 2^{-\eta\,\sigma(\mathbf{t})}$ for some constant $\eta > 0$. To establish the intersection property given by (66), define ψ^* by setting $\psi^*_{\mathbf{t}} = 2^{-\eta/2\,\sigma(\mathbf{t})}$. Obviously, $\psi^* \in \mathbf{\Psi}$. Next, fix two distinct α and α' in $\mathcal{A}$. By definition,

$$\alpha = (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \alpha' = (\mathbf{p}', \mathbf{q}')$$

for some $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}' \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ and $\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{q}' \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$. Now, take any point

$$\boldsymbol{X} \;\in\; \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha, \psi_{\mathbf{t}}) \cap \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha', \psi_{\mathbf{t}}) \;:=\; \Delta^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha, \psi_{\mathbf{t}}) \cap \Delta^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha', \psi_{\mathbf{t}}) \;.$$

Clearly, we may as well assume that the intersection is non-empty. In the notation of § 4, we have that

$$|g_{\mathbf{t}} M^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{X}} \alpha| \, < \psi_{\mathbf{t}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad |g_{\mathbf{t}} M^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{X}} \alpha'| \, < \psi_{\mathbf{t}} \,. \tag{72}$$

Let $\alpha'' := (\mathbf{p}'', \mathbf{q}'')$, where $\mathbf{p}'' := \mathbf{p} - \mathbf{p}' \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ and $\mathbf{q}'' := \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}' \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. Since $\mathbf{T}$ satisfies (45) and therefore (53), it follows that

$$|g_{\mathbf{t}} M_{\mathbf{X}} \alpha''| \;=\; |g_{\mathbf{t}} M_{\mathbf{X}} (\alpha - \alpha')| \;=\; |g_{\mathbf{t}} M^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{X}} \alpha - g_{\mathbf{t}} M^{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{X}} \alpha'| \;\overset{(72)}{<}\; 2\psi_{\mathbf{t}} \;<\; \psi^*_{\mathbf{t}} \tag{73}$$

for all but finitely many $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}$. If $\mathbf{q}'' = \mathbf{0}$, we obtain via (73) that $|\mathbf{p}''| < \psi^*_{\mathbf{t}} < 1$ for all but finitely many $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}$. However $\mathbf{p}'' \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ and so we must have $\mathbf{p}'' = \mathbf{0}$. This contradicts the assumption that $\alpha \neq \alpha'$. The upshot is that $\mathbf{q}'' \neq \mathbf{0}$ and so $\alpha'' \in \mathcal{A}$. Hence, it follows that

$$\boldsymbol{X} \in \Delta_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha'', \psi^*_{\mathbf{t}}) \subset \Delta_{\mathbf{t}}(\psi^*_{\mathbf{t}}) := \mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{t}}(\psi^*_{\mathbf{t}})$$

for all but finitely many $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}$. This verifies the intersection property.

Verifying the contracting property. Recall, μ is a measure on $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ that is strongly contracting. Therefore, μ is by definition non-atomic, doubling and finite. Also without loss of generality we can assume that the support $\boldsymbol{S}$ of μ is bounded. Thus, to establish that μ is contracting with respect to $(\mathrm{I}, \mathbf{\Psi})$ it remains to verify the conditions given by (67) – (70). Fix $\psi \in \mathbf{\Psi}$. Then, $\psi_{\mathbf{t}} = 2^{-\eta\,\sigma(\mathbf{t})}$ for some constant $\eta > 0$ and we define ψ^+ by setting $\psi^+_{\mathbf{t}} := \sqrt{\psi_{\mathbf{t}}}$. Obviously, $\psi^+ \in \mathbf{\Psi}$. Let r_0 be the positive constant appearing in the definition of strongly contracting. Since $\mathbf{T}$ satisfies (45) and therefore (53), it follows that

$$\psi^+_{\mathbf{t}} \leqslant \min\{1, r_0\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sigma(\mathbf{t}) \geqslant 0 \tag{74}$$

for all but finitely many $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}$. Now fix such a $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \ldots, t_{m+n}) \in \mathbf{T}$ and $\alpha' = (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q}) \in \mathcal{A}$. The set $\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha', \psi_{\mathbf{t}})$ corresponds to $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ satisfying

$$|\boldsymbol{X}_j\, \mathbf{q} + p_j + \theta_j| < 2^{-t_j} \psi_{\mathbf{t}} \quad (1 \leqslant j \leqslant m) \quad \text{with} \quad |q_i| < 2^{t_{m+i}} \psi_{\mathbf{t}} \quad (1 \leqslant i \leqslant n) \;. \tag{75}$$

Similarly, $\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha', \psi^+_{\mathbf{t}})$ corresponds to $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ satisfying

$$|\boldsymbol{X}_j\, \mathbf{q} + p_j + \theta_j| < 2^{-t_j} \psi^+_{\mathbf{t}} \quad (1 \leqslant j \leqslant m) \quad \text{with} \quad |q_i| < 2^{t_{m+i}} \psi^+_{\mathbf{t}} \quad (1 \leqslant i \leqslant n) \;. \tag{76}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that the right hand side inequalities of (75) and (76) are fulfilled for $\alpha' = (\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{q})$. Otherwise, the sets under consideration are empty and the conditions (68) – (70) are easily met. For $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, define

$$\varepsilon_j = \varepsilon_{j,\mathbf{t}} := 2^{-t_j}\psi_{\mathbf{t}}^{+}/|\mathbf{q}|_2 \qquad \text{and let} \qquad \delta = \delta_{\mathbf{t}} := \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^{+}. \tag{77}$$

By (39) and the fact that $\sigma(\mathbf{t}) \geqslant 0$, it follows that $\sum_{j=1}^{m} t_j \geqslant 0$ and so there exists $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ such that $2^{-t_j} \leqslant 1$. Since $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ we have that $|\mathbf{q}|_2^{-1} \leqslant 1$. Therefore $\min_{1 \leqslant j \leqslant m} \varepsilon_{j,\mathbf{t}} < \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^{+}$ and (74) implies that

$$\min_{1 \leqslant j \leqslant m} \varepsilon_{j,\mathbf{t}} < r_0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \delta_{\mathbf{t}} < 1 \ .$$

By the definition of $\psi_{\mathbf{t}}^{+}$, we have that $\delta\varepsilon_j = 2^{-t_j}\psi_{\mathbf{t}}/|\mathbf{q}|_2$ for each $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Therefore, by (75) and (76), it follows that

$$\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha', \psi_{\mathbf{t}}) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}^{(\delta\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha', \psi_{\mathbf{t}}^{+}) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}^{(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})} \ , \tag{78}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}^{(\delta\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}^{(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})}$ are defined by (12) with $\mathbf{a} := \mathbf{q}/|\mathbf{q}|_2$ and $\mathbf{b} := (\mathbf{p} + \boldsymbol{\theta})/|\mathbf{q}|_2$. By the definition of strongly contracting, for each $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}^{(\delta\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})} \cap \boldsymbol{S}$ there is an open ball $B = B_{\boldsymbol{X}}$ centred at $\boldsymbol{X}$ such that (13) and (14) are satisfied. With reference to the general framework, define $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha'}$ to be the collection of all such balls. By definition, each point $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}^{(\delta\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})} \cap \boldsymbol{S}$ is the centre of a ball in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha'}$. Finally, for any $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}$, let

$$k_{\mathbf{t}} \ := \ C\,(\psi_{\mathbf{t}}^{+})^{\alpha}$$

where C and α are the constants appearing in the definition of strongly contracting. Then

(67) follows from (45);

(68) follows from the definition of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha'}$;

(69) and (70) follow from (13) and (14) via (78).

This verifies that μ is contracting with respect to $(\mathrm{I}, \boldsymbol{\Psi})$.

⊠

Remark. When dealing with Theorem 1A, the above arguments remain essentially unchanged. The main difference is that we work with the specific $\mathbf{T}$ given by (49′). Then for any $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_{m+n}) \in \mathbf{T}$, we have that $t_1 = \cdots = t_m$. This ensure that $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_m$ as defined by (77) are all equal and therefore μ being contracting rather than strongly contracting is sufficient.

6 Preliminaries for Theorem 5

In this section we group together various self contained statements that we appeal to during the course of establishing the Inhomogeneous Transference Principle. We start with a basic covering result from geometric measure theory.

Lemma 2 *Every collection $\mathcal{C}$ of balls of uniformly bounded diameter in a metric space contains a disjoint subcollection $\mathcal{G}$ such that*

$$\bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{C}} B \subset \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{G}} 5B\,.$$

This covering lemma is usually referred to as the $5r$-lemma. For further details and proof the reader is refereed to [24, 32]. The following enables us to bound the cardinality of the disjoint collection arising from the $5r$-lemma.

Lemma 3 *Let (Ω, d) be a metric space equipped with a finite measure μ. Then every disjoint collection $\mathcal{C}$ of μ-measurable subsets of Ω with positive μ-measure is at most countable.*

Proof. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $\mathcal{C}^{(k)}$ be the subcollection of $\mathcal{C}$ consisting of sets $B \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $2^k \leqslant \mu(B) < 2^{k+1}$. Obviously we have that $\mathcal{C} = \bigcup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{C}^{(k)}$. Since the balls in $\mathcal{C}$ are pairwise disjoint, it follows that $\#\mathcal{C}^{(k)} \leqslant 2^{-k}\mu(\Omega) < \infty$. Therefore, $\mathcal{C}$ is a countable union of finite sets and so is at most countable.

⊠

The next statement is a simple consequence of the continuity of measures.

Lemma 4 *Let (Ω, d) be a metric space equipped with a measure μ. Let $\{A_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of μ-measurable subsets of Ω and*

$$A_\infty \ := \ \limsup_{i\to\infty} A_i = \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{i=m}^{\infty} A_i \ .$$

Then $\mu(A_\infty) = 0$ if and only if for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a positive constant $m_0(\varepsilon)$ such that $\mu(\bigcup_{i=m}^{\infty} A_i) < \varepsilon$ for all $m > m_0(\varepsilon)$.

Recall, that the Borel-Cantelli lemma from probability theory states that

$$\mu(A_\infty) = 0 \qquad \text{if} \qquad \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_i) \ < \ \infty \ .$$

Sprindzuk's proof of Mahler's conjecture is based on the notions of essential and inessential domains – see [38, §14]. As we shall soon see, the proof of Theorem 5 is based on the related notions of μ-essential and μ-inessential balls. The following lemma enables us to exploit these key notions.

Lemma 5 *Let* (Ω, d) *be a metric space equipped with a finite measure* μ*. Let* $\{B_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ *be a sequence of* μ*-measurable subsets of* Ω*. Suppose there exists a constant* $c \in (0,1)$ *such that for every* $i \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\mu\Big(B_i \cap \textstyle\bigcup_{j\neq i} B_j\Big) \leqslant c\,\mu(B_i)\,. \tag{79}$$

Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_i) \;\leqslant\; \frac{1}{1-c}\,\mu(\Omega)\,.$$

Proof. Given $i \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$B_i^0 := B \setminus \bigcup_{j\neq i} B_j \qquad \text{and} \qquad B_i^1 := B \cap \bigcup_{j\neq i} B_j\,.$$

Thus, B_i^0 corresponds to the region of B_i that is disjoint from the sets B_j with $j \neq i$. On the other hand, B_i^1 corresponds to the region of B_i that is non-disjoint from the sets B_j with $j \neq i$. Obviously B_i^0 and B_i^1 are μ-measurable. By (79), we have that $\mu(B_i^0) = \mu(B) - \mu(B_i^1) > (1-c)\mu(B)$. Thus,

$$\mu(B) \leqslant \frac{1}{1-c}\,\mu(B_i^0)\,. \tag{80}$$

By construction, $B_i^0 \cap B_j^0 = \emptyset$ for distinct $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_i) \overset{(80)}{\leqslant} \frac{1}{1-c}\,\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mu(B_i^0) \;=\; \frac{1}{1-c}\,\mu\Big(\bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}}^{\circ} B_i^0\Big) \leqslant \frac{1}{1-c}\,\mu(\Omega)\,.$$

⊠

7 Proof of Theorem 5

Fix any $\psi \in \Psi$. The goal is to show that

$$\mu(\Lambda_{\mathrm{I}}(\psi)) = 0\,. \tag{81}$$

We are given that μ is contracting with respect to $(\mathrm{I}, \boldsymbol{\Psi})$. Note that we can assume that this contacting property and indeed the intersection property defined in §5, are valid for all $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}$ rather than all but finitely many – removing a finite number of elements from $\mathbf{T}$ does not alter the lim sup set $\Lambda_{\mathrm{I}}(\psi)$ under consideration. With this in mind, let $\psi^+ \in \boldsymbol{\Psi}$ be the function, $\{k_{\mathbf{t}}\}$ be the sequence and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}$ be the collection of balls arising from the contracting property. Since $\boldsymbol{S} = \operatorname{supp}\mu$ is bounded, we can assume that the balls in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}$ are of radius bounded by $r = \operatorname{diam}(\boldsymbol{S})$. Indeed, if $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}$ contains a ball B of radius bigger than

r centered at x then we can replace B with $B(x,r)$. This replacement would not affect the properties (68)–(70) as $\boldsymbol{S} \subset B(x,r)$. Thus, in view of Lemma 2 there is a disjoint subcollection $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}$ of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}$ such that

$$\bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}} B \subset \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}} 5B\,. \tag{82}$$

Every ball $B \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}$ is centred at the support of μ and so is of positive μ-measure. Thus, by Lemma 3, the collection $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}$ is at most countable. In view of (68) and (82) we have that

$$\boldsymbol{S}\cap \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha,\psi_{\mathbf{t}}) \;\subset\; \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}} 5B\cap \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha,\psi_{\mathbf{t}}) \;\subset\; \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha,\psi_{\mathbf{t}})\,.$$

Taking the union over all $\alpha\in\mathcal{A}$ and using (64) gives

$$\boldsymbol{S}\cap \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\psi_{\mathbf{t}}) \;\subset\; \bigcup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}\bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}} 5B\cap \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha,\psi_{\mathbf{t}}) \;\subset\; \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\psi_{\mathbf{t}})\,.$$

In view of (65), it follows that

$$\boldsymbol{S}\cap \Lambda_{\mathrm{I}}(\psi) \;\subset\; \limsup_{\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{T}} \bigcup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}\bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}} 5B\cap \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha,\psi_{\mathbf{t}}) \;\subset\; \Lambda_{\mathrm{I}}(\psi)\,.$$

This implies that

$$\mu(\Lambda_{\mathrm{I}}(\psi)) \;=\; \mu\Big(\limsup_{\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{T}} \bigcup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}\bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}} 5B\cap \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha,\psi_{\mathbf{t}})\Big)\,. \tag{83}$$

Thus, (81) will follow on establishing that the right hand side of (83) is zero. The key that enables us to do precisely this, is the following decomposition of the right hand side lim sup set in terms of μ-essential and μ-inessential balls.

Definition. A ball $B\in\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}$ is said to be *μ-essential* if

$$\mu\Big(B\,\cap \bigcup_{\alpha'\in\mathcal{A}\smallsetminus\{\alpha\}}\ \bigcup_{B'\in\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha'}} B'\Big) \;\leqslant\; \frac{1}{2}\,\mu(B) \tag{84}$$

and *μ-inessential* otherwise.

Let $\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}$ denote the collection of μ-essential balls in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}$ and let $\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}$ denote the collection of μ-inessential balls in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}$. Consider the corresponding limsup sets

$$\Lambda_{\mathrm{D}} := \limsup_{\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{T}}\ \bigcup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}\ \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}} 5B\cap \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha,\psi_{\mathbf{t}})\,,$$

and

$$\Lambda_{\mathrm{N}} = \limsup_{\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{T}}\ \bigcup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}\ \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}} 5B\cap \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha,\psi_{\mathbf{t}})\,.$$

It is easily seen that the limsup set in the right hand side of (83) is equal to $\Lambda_{\rm N} \cup \Lambda_{\rm D}$ and so we have that

$$\mu(\Lambda_{\rm I}(\psi)) \ = \mu(\Lambda_{\rm D} \cup \Lambda_{\rm N}) \ .$$

Thus, the statement of Theorem 5 will follow on showing that $\mu(\Lambda_{\rm D}) = 0$ and $\mu(\Lambda_{\rm N}) = 0$.

7.1 The μ-essential case: $\mu(\Lambda_{\rm D}) = 0$

In view of (84), Lemma 5 and the fact that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}$ is a disjoint collection of balls, we have that

$$\sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \sum_{B\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}} \mu(B) \leqslant 2\mu(\Omega)\,. \tag{85}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu\Big(\bigcup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \ \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}} 5B \cap {\rm I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha,\psi_{\mathbf{t}})\Big) \ \ &\leqslant \ \ \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \ \sum_{B\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}} \mu\Big(5B \cap {\rm I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha,\psi_{\mathbf{t}})\Big) \\
&\overset{(70)}{\leqslant} \ \ \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \sum_{B\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}} k_{\mathbf{t}} \ \mu(5B) \\
&\overset{(10)}{\leqslant} \ \ k_{\mathbf{t}} \ \lambda^3 \sum_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \ \sum_{B\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}} \mu(B) \\
&\overset{(85)}{\leqslant} \ \ 2 \ \mu(\Omega)\lambda^3 k_{\mathbf{t}}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mu(\Omega) < \infty$, the quantity $2\mu(\Omega)\lambda^3$ is a finite positive constant. Hence,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{T}} \ \mu\Big(\bigcup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}} 5B \cap {\rm I}_{\mathbf{t}}(\alpha,\psi_{\mathbf{t}})\Big) \ \ll \ \sum_{\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{T}} k_{\mathbf{t}} \ \overset{(67)}{<} \ \infty\,.$$

A simple consequence of the Borel-Cantelli lemma is that $\mu(\Lambda_{\rm D}) = 0$.

7.2 The μ-inessential case: $\mu(\Lambda_{\rm N}) = 0$

For a ball $B \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}$, let

$$B_{\rm N} := B \ \cap \bigcup_{\alpha'\in\mathcal{A}\setminus\{\alpha\}} \ \bigcup_{B'\in\mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha'}} B'\,.$$

By definition,

$$\mu(B_{\rm N}) > \tfrac{1}{2}\,\mu(B)\ . \tag{86}$$

Consider the following two sets

$$\Lambda'_{\mathrm{N}} = \limsup_{\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{T}} \bigcup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}} 5B \qquad \text{and} \qquad \Lambda''_{\mathrm{N}} = \limsup_{\mathbf{t}\in\mathbf{T}} \bigcup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}} B_{\mathrm{N}}\,.$$

Obviously we have that $\Lambda_{\mathrm{N}} \subset \Lambda'_{\mathrm{N}}$. Hence, it suffices to show that

$$\mu(\Lambda'_{\mathrm{N}}) = 0\,.$$

Step 1: $\mu(\Lambda''_{\mathrm{N}}) = 0$**.** Note that in view of (69), for any $B \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha} \subset \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha}$ we have that

$$\boldsymbol{S} \cap B \ \subset \ \mathrm{I}(\alpha, \psi^+_{\mathbf{t}})\ . \tag{87}$$

By definition, if $x \in \boldsymbol{S} \cap B_{\mathrm{N}}$ then there exists $\alpha' \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{\alpha\}$ and a ball $B' \in \mathcal{G}_{\mathbf{t},\alpha'}$ such that $x \in B'$. Again, by (69) we have that

$$\boldsymbol{S} \cap B' \ \subset \ \mathrm{I}(\alpha', \psi^+_{\mathbf{t}})\ . \tag{88}$$

Since $x \in \boldsymbol{S} \cap B \cap B'$, it follows via (87) and (88) that

$$x \in \mathrm{I}(\alpha, \psi^+_{\mathbf{t}}) \cap \mathrm{I}(\alpha', \psi^+_{\mathbf{t}}).$$

We are given that $(\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{I}, \boldsymbol{\Psi})$ satisfies the intersection property. Thus, in view of (66) we conclude that

$$x \in \mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{t}}(\psi^*_{\mathbf{t}})\ ,$$

where $\psi^* \in \boldsymbol{\Psi}$ is associated with ψ^+. The upshot is that if $x \in \boldsymbol{S} \cap \Lambda''_{\mathrm{N}}$, then x lies in the 'homogeneous' sets $\mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{t}}(\psi^*_{\mathbf{t}})$ for infinitely many $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbf{T}$. In other words, $\boldsymbol{S} \cap \Lambda''_{\mathrm{N}} \subset \Lambda_{\mathrm{H}}(\psi^*)$. However, homogeneous lim sup sets are assumed to be of μ-measure zero - see (71). Therefore,

$$\mu(\Lambda''_{\mathrm{N}}) = 0\ . \tag{89}$$

Step 2: $\mu(\Lambda'_{\mathrm{N}}) = 0$**.** Fix any enumeration $\{\mathbf{t}_l\}_{l\in\mathbb{N}}$ of the set $\mathbf{T}$. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\Lambda''_{\mathrm{N}}(m) := \bigcup_{l\geqslant m} \bigcup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}} \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{t}_l,\alpha}} B_{\mathrm{N}}\,. \tag{90}$$

Then, $\Lambda''_{\mathrm{N}} = \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \Lambda''_{\mathrm{N}}(m)$. In view of (89), it follows via Lemma 4 that for any $\delta > 0$, there exists a positive constant $m_0(\delta)$ such that

$$\mu\big(\Lambda''_{\mathrm{N}}(m)\big) < \delta \qquad \forall \quad m > m_0(\delta)\ . \tag{91}$$

Let $\mathcal{G}(m)$ be the collection of balls $5B$ such that $B \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{t}_l,\alpha}$ with $l \geqslant m$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$. By (90), for any $5B \in \mathcal{G}(m)$ we have that $B \cap \Lambda''_{\mathrm{N}}(m) \supset B_{\mathrm{N}}$. Therefore,

$$\mu(B \cap \Lambda''_{\mathrm{N}}(m)) \geqslant \mu(B_{\mathrm{N}}) \overset{(86)}{>} \tfrac{1}{2}\mu(B) \tag{92}$$

for any $5B \in \mathcal{G}(m)$. Recall that $\boldsymbol{S}$ is bounded and so $\mathcal{G}(m)$ is a collection of balls of uniformly bounded diameter. Thus, in view of Lemma 2 there is a disjoint subcollection $\mathcal{G}'(m)$ of $\mathcal{G}(m)$ such that

$$\bigcup_{5B\in\mathcal{G}(m)} 5B \ \subset \bigcup_{5B\in\mathcal{G}'(m)} 25B\,.$$

Finally, for $m \geqslant m_0(\delta)$ let

$$\Lambda'_{\mathrm{N}}(m) \ := \bigcup_{l\geqslant m}\ \bigcup_{\alpha\in\mathcal{A}}\ \bigcup_{B\in\mathcal{N}_{\mathbf{t}_l,\alpha}} 5B\,.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(\Lambda'_{\mathrm{N}}(m)) \ &\leqslant\ \mu\Big(\bigcup_{5B\in\mathcal{G}'(m)} 25B\Big) \\
&\leqslant\ \sum_{5B\in\mathcal{G}'(m)} \mu\big(25B\big) \\
&\overset{(10)}{\leqslant}\ \lambda^5 \sum_{5B\in\mathcal{G}'(m)} \mu\big(B\big) \\
&\overset{(92)}{\leqslant}\ 2\lambda^5 \sum_{5B\in\mathcal{G}'(m)} \mu\big(B\cap\Lambda''_{\mathrm{N}}(m)\big) \\
&=\ 2\lambda^5\mu\Big(\overset{\circ}{\bigcup_{5B\in\mathcal{G}'(m)}} B\cap\Lambda''_{\mathrm{N}}(m)\Big) \\
&\leqslant\ 2\lambda^5\mu\big(\Lambda''_{\mathrm{N}}(m)\big) \\
&\overset{(91)}{\leqslant}\ 2\lambda^5\delta\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Lambda'_{\mathrm{N}} = \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty}\Lambda'_{\mathrm{N}}(m)$, it follows via Lemma 4 that $\mu(\Lambda'_{\mathrm{N}}) = 0$.

$\boxtimes$

8 Final comments and open problems

In principle, there are numerous problems that can be treated by applying the basic recipes introduced in this paper – in particular the Inhomogeneous Transference Principle of §5. The goal here is to indicate the diversity of these problems beyond those considered in the main bulk of the paper.

Beyond simultaneous and dual extremality: *d*-extremality. The dual theory of Diophantine approximation is concerned with approximation of points in $\mathbb{R}^n$ by $(n-1)$–

dimensional rational planes; i.e. rational hyperplanes. The simultaneous theory of Diophantine approximation is concerned with approximation of points in $\mathbb{R}^n$ by 0–dimensional rational planes; i.e. rational points. As a consequence of Khintchine's transference principle, the two forms of approximation lead to equivalent notions of extremality in the homogeneous case. However, as a consequence of a recent work by Laurent a lot more is true. For $d \in \{0, \dots n-1\}$, it is natural to consider the Diophantine approximation theory in which points in $\mathbb{R}^n$ are approximated by d-dimensional rational planes – the dual and simultaneous theories just represent the extreme. The related homogeneous Diophantine exponents $\omega_d(\mathbf{x})$ have been studied in some depth by Schmidt [35] in the sixties and more recently by Laurent [30]. We refer the reader to Laurent [30] for the definition of these exponents. For the purpose of this discussion, it suffices to say that for any $d \in \{0, \dots n-1\}$, we have that $\omega_d(\mathbf{x}) \geqslant (d+1)/(n-d)$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Now let μ be a measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and say that μ is *d–extremal* if

$$\omega_d(\mathbf{x}) = (d+1)/(n-d) \qquad \text{for } \mu\text{-almost all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Khintchine's transference principle implies that the extreme cases ($d = 0$ and $d = n-1$) of d–extremal are equivalent. Leaving aside the details, the Schmidt-Laurent 'Going-up' and 'Going-down' transference inequalities imply that all n notions of d–extremality are in fact equivalent. This together with Theorem KLW implies the following statement.

Theorem 6 *Any friendly measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is d-extremal for all $d \in \{0, \dots n-1\}$.*

Given the equivalence of the n notions of d–extremality, there is no need to distinguish between them. Indeed, for measures μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ it makes perfect sense to redefine the standard notion of extremal and say that μ *is extremal* if μ is d–extremal for all $d \in \{0, \dots n-1\}$. Recall, that the standard notion only requires that μ is d–extremal for $d = 0$ and $d = n-1$.

In view of [30], it is natural to extend the notion of d-extremality to the inhomogeneous setup. Here an approximating d-dimensional rational plane is shifted by an appropriately scaled transversal vector parameterised by $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-d}$ – the inhomogeneous part. Leaving aside the details, let $\omega_d(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ denote the inhomogeneous Diophantine exponent that arises in this way. Then, given a measure μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ we say that μ is *inhomogeneously d–extremal* if for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-d}$

$$\omega_d(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = (d+1)/(n-d) \qquad \text{for } \mu\text{-almost all } \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

In view of the above case for redefining the (homogeneous) notion of extremal for measures μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, it would be quite natural to say that μ *is inhomogeneously extremal* if μ is inhomogeneously d–extremal for all $d \in \{0, \dots n-1\}$. The definition given in §1.3 only requires that μ is inhomogeneously d–extremal for $d = 0$ and $d = n-1$. In any case, the problem of establishing the inhomogeneous generalisation of Theorem 6 now arises.

Conjecture 1 *Any friendly measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is inhomogeneously d-extremal for all $d \in \{0, \dots n-1\}$.*

Unlike the homogeneous case, the Schmidt-Laurent transference inequalities are not applicable and the n notions of inhomogeneously d–extremality are not necessarily equivalent. Consequently, each one needs to be considered separately. Clearly, Theorem 2 implies the desired statement for $d = 0$ and $d = n - 1$ but they do not imply the statement for d between these extreme values as in the homogeneous case. For measures μ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ one can define the notion of *d-contracting* by replacing the planes $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$ appearing in the definition of contracting (Definition 3) with d-dimensional planes. Conjecture 1 would then follow on establishing the following generalization of Theorem 1A subject to showing that friendly measures are d-contracting.

Conjecture 2 *Let μ be a measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $d \in \{0, \dots n-1\}$. If μ is d-contracting almost everywhere then*

$$\mu \text{ is } d\text{-extremal} \iff \mu \text{ is inhomogeneously } d\text{-extremal.}$$

In order to establish Conjecture 2, it would be natural to follow the recipe used to establish Theorem 1A. This involves obtaining upper and lower bounds for $\omega_d(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ separately. In short, the upper bound would follow on applying the Inhomogeneous Transference Principle. Of course, this is subject to being able to reformulate the upper bound problem analogues to that of § 4 and verifying the contracting axioms of § 5. The lower bound would follow on establishing an analogue of Theorem BL or at least an analogue of Cassels' Theorem VI in [20, Chapter 5] within the setting of approximating points in $\mathbb{R}^n$ by d-dimensional planes. More precisely, concerning the former we seek a lower bound for $\omega_d(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ in terms of the uniform homogeneous exponent $\widehat{\omega}_{d'}(\mathbf{x})$ for some $0 \le d' \le n - 1$. This is an intriguing problem in its own right and we suspect that the following represents the precise relationship.

Conjecture 3 *Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $d \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. Then for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-d}$*

$$\omega_d(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \;\geqslant\; \frac{1}{\widehat{\omega}_{n-1-d}(\mathbf{x})}.$$

Note that Conjecture 3 coincides with the left hand side inequality of (37) in the extreme cases $d = 0$ and $d = n - 1$.

Beyond extremality in $\mathbb{R}^n$: system of linear forms. The theory of inhomogeneous extremality for measures on $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ corresponding to a genuine system of linear forms is not covered by Theorem 2 or indeed Conjecture 1 above. By genuine we simply mean that both m and n are strictly greater than one and so we are outside of the dual and simultaneous theories. Naturally it would be highly desirable to establish a general result for measures on $\mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ analogues to Theorem 2 or simply Theorem 3. However, such a result is currently non-existent even in the homogeneous setting for manifolds and constitutes a key open problem. Indeed, the homogeneous 'manifold' problem first eluded to in [29, §6.2] is formally stated in [23, Question 35]. Part of the issue lies in determining the right formulation of non-degeneracy and more generally friendly condition. However, in view of Theorem 1 any progress on the homogeneous extremality problem can be transferred over to the inhomogeneous setting.

Beyond extremality: Khintchine-Groshev type results. The inhomogeneous extremality results obtained in this paper constitute the first step towards developing a coherent inhomogeneous theory for manifolds in line with the homogeneous theory [4, 7, 16]. It would be desirable to adapt the techniques of this paper to obtain the inhomogeneous analogues of the convergence Khintchine-Groshev type results.

Beyond Euclidean spaces : $\mathbb{C}$, $\mathbb{Q}_p$ and S-arithmetic. In a nutshell, Theorem 1 enables us to transfer homogeneous extremality statements for measures on a Euclidean space to inhomogeneous statements. It would be desirable to obtain analogous results within the p-adic, complex or more generally the S-arithmetic setup. To this end, we refer the reader to the papers [8, 9, 22, 26, 28, 33] and references within for the various homogeneous results. The Inhomogeneous Transference Principle (Theorem 5) is applicable within these non-Euclidean settings and provides a natural path for obtaining the desired inhomogeneous generalisations.

Beyond rigid inhomogeneous approximation. Within the context of the Diophantine approximation problems addressed in this paper – namely that of inhomogeneous extremality – the inhomogeneous part is arbitrary but always fixed. However, for various Diophantine approximation problems there are often major advantages in treating the inhomogeneous part as a variable. For example, in (1) we may consider the situation in which $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is a function of the approximated point $\boldsymbol{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{m\times n}$ under consideration. Geometrically, on allowing $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ to depend on $\boldsymbol{X}$ we perturb the underlying approximating planes $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$ – see (11). These 'perturbed planes' now play the role of the approximating objects and are not necessarily planes. However, the fact that the approximating objects are no longer planes is completely irrelevant when it comes to applying the Inhomogeneous Transference Principle (Theorem 5). In short, as long as the intersection and contracting properties are satisfied the Inhomogeneous Transference Principle can be used and the nature of the approximating objects is irrelevant.

To clarify the above discussion, we describe a conjecture that can be treated as an inhomogeneous problem in which the inhomogeneous part is a variable. Let $\psi : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ be a monotonic function such that $\psi(r) \to 0$ as $r \to \infty$ and for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ consider the solubility of the inequality

$$|x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0| < \psi\big(|\mathbf{a}|\big) \tag{93}$$

in integer vectors $\mathbf{a} = (a_{n-1}, \ldots, a_0) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. Note that when the right hand side of (93) is small, the above inequality implies that there exists an algebraic integer close to x. The following divergence statement is due to Bugeaud [18].

Theorem B *Let ψ be a monotonic function such that $\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} q^{n-2}\psi(q)$ diverges. Then, for almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ the inequality (93) has infinitely many solutions $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$.*

Establishing the convergence counterpart to Theorem B represents an open problem analogous to a problem of A. Baker [2] settled by Bernik [11].

Conjecture 4 *Let ψ be a monotonic function such that $\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} q^{n-2}\psi(q)$ converges. Then, for almost all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ the inequality (93) has at most finitely many solutions $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$.*

In the special case that $\psi(q) = q^{-n+1-\varepsilon}$ with $\varepsilon > 0$, the above conjecture can be viewed as the algebraic integers analogue of Mahler's problem [31]. In terms of establishing Conjecture 4, our approach is to view it as a problem in inhomogeneous Diophantine approximation in which the inhomogeneous part $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ is a variable. This is simple enough to do! With reference to inequality (93), we let θ be x^n. Thus, Conjecture 4 is equivalent to a 'perturbed' inhomogeneous Diophantine approximation problem restricted to the Veronese curve $\mathcal{V}_{n-1}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. We claim that the perturbed inhomogeneous problem can be treated via the methods introduced in this paper. We intend to return to Conjecture 4 in a forthcoming paper.

Acknowledgements. SV would like to thank the dynamic duo Iona and Ayesha for prolonging his youth – of course only in the mind! Also, happy number six girls and "oo ee a a a walla walla bing bang hey!" to you too. VB would like to thank Vasili Bernik for an interesting discussion that has triggered this work. Also VB and SV wish him happy SIXTY ONE – many happy returns of the day, Basil!

VICTOR BERESNEVICH
UNIVERSITY OF YORK, HESLINGTON, YORK, YO10 5DD, ENGLAND
E-mail address: vb8@york.ac.uk

SANJU VELANI
UNIVERSITY OF YORK, HESLINGTON, YORK, YO10 5DD, ENGLAND
E-mail address: slv3@york.ac.uk

References

[1] D. BADZIAHIN: *Inhomogenaous Diophantine approximation on manifolds*, PhD Thesis, University of York, 2007.

[2] A. Baker: *On a theorem of Sprindžuk*, Proc. Royal Soc. Series A, 292 (1966), pp. 92–104.

[3] A. Baker: *Transcendental number theory*, Cambridge University Press, London, 1975.

[4] V. Beresnevich: *A Groshev type theorem for convergence on manifolds*, Acta Math. Hungar., 94 (2002), pp. 99–130.

[5] V. Beresnevich and V. Bernik: *On a metrical theorem of W. Schmidt*, Acta Arith., 75 (1996), pp. 219–233.

[6] V. Beresnevich, V. Bernik, D. Dickinson and M. Dodson: *On linear manifolds for which the Khinchin approximation theorem holds*, Vestsī Nats. Akad. Navuk Belarusī Ser. Fīz.-Mat. Navuk, (2000), pp. 14–17, 139.

[7] V. V. Beresnevich, V. I. Bernik, D. Y. Kleinbock, and G. A. Margulis, *Metric Diophantine approximation: the Khintchine-Groshev theorem for nondegenerate manifolds*, Mosc. Math. J., 2 (2002), pp. 203–225. Dedicated to Yuri I. Manin on the occasion of his 65th birthday.

[8] V. Beresnevich, V. I. Bernik, and E. I. Kovalevskaya: *On approximation of p-adic numbers by p-adic algebraic numbers*, J. Number Theory, 111 (2005), pp. 33–56.

[9] V. Beresnevich and È. I. Kovalevskaya: *On Diophantine approximations of dependent quantities in the p-adic case*, Mat. Zametki, 73 (2003), pp. 22–37.

[10] V. Beresnevich and S. Velani: *Simultaneous inhomogeneous diophantine approximation on manifolds*. `arXiv:0710.5685`, (2007), pp. 1–13.

[11] V. Bernik, *On the exact order of approximation of zero by values of integral polynomials*, Acta Arithmetica, 53 (1989), pp. 17–28. (In Russian).

[12] V. I. Bernik and V. N. Borbat: *Polynomials with overfalls of the values of coefficients and A. Baker's conjecture*, Vestsī Akad. Navuk Belarusī Ser. Fīz.-Mat. Navuk, (1997), pp. 5–8, 138.

[13] V. Bernik, D. Dickinson and M. Dodson: *Approximation of real numbers by values of integer polynomials*, Dokl. Nats. Akad. Nauk Belarusi, 42 (1998), pp. 51–54, 123.

[14] V. Bernik, H. Dickinson and J. Yuan: *Inhomogeneous Diophantine approximation on polynomial curves in $\mathbb{Q}_p$*, Acta Arithm., 90 (1999), pp. 37–48.

[15] V. Bernik and M. Dodson: *Metric Diophantine approximation on manifolds*, vol. 137 of Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[16] V. Bernik, D. Kleinbock, and G. A. Margulis, *Khintchine-type theorems on manifolds: the convergence case for standard and multiplicative versions*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices, (2001), pp. 453–486.

[17] V. Bernik and E. Kovalevskaya: *Simultaneous inhomogeneous Diophantine approximation of the values of integral polynomials with respect to Archimedean and non-Archimedean valuations*, Acta Math. Univ. Ostrav., 14 (2006), pp. 37–42.

[18] Y. Bugeaud: *Approximation by algebraic integers and Hausdorff dimension*, J. Lond. Math. Soc., 65 (2002), pp. 547–559.

[19] Y. Bugeaud and M. Laurent: *On exponents of homogeneous and inhomogeneous Diophantine approximation*, Mosc. Math. J., 5 (2005), pp. 747–766, 972.

[20] J. W. S. Cassels: *An introduction to Diophantine Approximation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1957.

[21] J. W. S. Cassels: *An introduction to the geometry of numbers*, Classics in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997. Corrected reprint of the 1971 edition.

[22] A. Ghosh: *Metric Diophantine approximation over a local field of positive characteristic*, J. Number Theory, 124 (2007), pp. 454–469.

[23] A. Gorodnik: *Open problems in dynamics and related fields*, J. Mod. Dyn., 1 (2007), pp. 1–35.

[24] J. Heinonen: *Lectures on analysis on metric spaces.* Universitext, Springer – Verlag, 2001.

[25] D. Kleinbock: *Extremal subspaces and their submanifolds*, Geom. Funct. Anal., 13 (2003), pp. 437–466.

[26] D. Kleinbock: *Baker-Sprindžuk conjectures for complex analytic manifolds*, in Algebraic groups and arithmetic, Tata Inst. Fund. Res., Mumbai, 2004, pp. 539–553.

[27] D. Kleinbock, E. Lindenstrauss and B. Weiss: *On fractal measures and Diophantine approximation*, Selecta Math. (N.S.), 10 (2004), pp. 479–523.

[28] D. Kleinbock and G. Tomanov: *Flows on S-arithmetic homogeneous spaces and applications to metric Diophantine approximation*, Comment. Math. Helv., 82 (2007), pp. 519–581.

[29] D. Y. Kleinbock and G. A. Margulis: *Flows on homogeneous spaces and Diophantine approximation on manifolds*, Ann. of Math. (2), 148 (1998), pp. 339–360.

[30] M. Laurent: *On transfer inequalities in Diophantine approximation.* March 2007, `arXiv:math/0703146`.

[31] K. Mahler: *Über das Maßder Menge aller S-Zahlen*, Math. Ann., 106 (1932), pp. 131–139.

[32] P. Mattila: *Geometry of sets and measures in Euclidean spaces. Fractals and rectifiability*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[33] A. Mohammadi and A. Salehi Golsefidy: *S-Arithmetic Khintchine-Type Theorem.* December 2007, `Preprint`.

[34] W. M. Schmidt: *Metrische Sätze über simultane Approximation abhängiger Größen*, Monatsch. Math., 63 (1964), pp. 154–166.

[35] W. M. Schmidt: *On heights of algebraic subspaces and diophantine approximations*, Ann. of Math. (2), 85 (1967), pp. 430–472.

[36] W. M. Schmidt: *Diophantine Approximation*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 1980.

[37] V. Sprindžuk: *Mahler's problem in the metric theory of numbers*, vol. 25, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1969. Translations of Mathematical Monographs.

[38] V. Sprindžuk: *Metric theory of Diophantine approximation*, John Wiley & Sons, New York-Toronto-London, 1979. (English transl.).

[39] V. Sprindžuk: *Achievements and problems in Diophantine approximation theory*, Russian Math. Surveys, 35 (1980), pp. 1–80.

[40] A. E. Ustinov: *Inhomogeneous approximations on manifolds in $\mathbb{Q}_p$*, Vestsī Nats. Akad. Navuk Belarusī Ser. Fīz.-Mat. Navuk, (2005), pp. 30–34, 124.

[41] A. E. Ustinov: *Approximation of complex numbers by values of integer polynomials*, Vestsī Nats. Akad. Navuk Belarusī Ser. Fīz.-Mat. Navuk, (2006), pp. 9–14, 124.

[42] K. R. Yu: *A note on a problem of Baker in metrical number theory*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc., 90 (1981), pp. 215–227.